

H. R. 7969. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helina W. Czajewski Visger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7970. A bill for the relief of Regina Watanabe (Mrs. Regina Anderson); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 7971. A bill for the relief of Cesare Buia, Gabriella Buia, and Daniela Buia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 7972. A bill for the relief of Joseph Girardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 7973. A bill for the relief of John Cardillo and Philip Cardillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7974. A bill for the relief of Jacob Reder and Erna Marcelina Frenkel Reder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WERDEL:

H. R. 7975. A bill to provide for the admission of Misses Janet and Daisy Wong to the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. WOODHOUSE:

H. R. 7976. A bill for the relief of Lillian M. Lanphear Collier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2041. By Mr. GOODWIN: Resolution of the Board of Aldermen of the City of Somerville, Mass., approving the liberalization of social-security benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2042. Also, resolution of the Board of Aldermen of the City of Somerville, Mass., favoring Federal legislation to aid education which will not exclude parochial-school children; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2043. By Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee: Petition of the Corporation of Sevierville, Sevier, Tenn., requesting that April 11, 1951, and every 50 years thereafter be designated as a legal holiday and named Half-Century Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 3, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, March 29, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer.

Almighty God, maker of all things, judge of all men, solemnize our hearts with reverential, penitential awe as in these holy days over which is the shadow of a cross we follow the wounded footsteps of man's best man, of love's best love. Teach us anew, as we look on Him in whose face Thy glory is revealed, the pretense of pride, the hollowness of ambition, the vanity of power, the deceit of riches, the disillusionment of fame. In the set and steadfast face of that servant of all, who rides on to die, may we see anew the might of love, the royalty of self-giving, the majesty of meekness. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of Friday, March 31, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on March 31, 1950, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 609. An act for the relief of Mrs. Bertie Grace Chan Leong;

S. 1543. An act to authorize the disposal of withdrawn public tracts too small to be classed as a farm unit under the Reclamation Act; and

S. 3084. An act authorizing the erection of a monument to the memory of Henry Milton Brainard at Cape Arago Light Station in Coos County, Oreg.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1758) to amend the Natural Gas Act approved June 21, 1938, as amended.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 7797) to provide foreign economic assistance, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 193) providing for adjournment of the House until April 18, 1950, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSIONS

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments was authorized to hold hearings at any time during this week and next week during the sessions of the Senate.

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	Langer
Anderson	Green	Lehman
Brewster	Gurney	Lodge
Bricker	Hayden	Long
Butler	Hendrickson	McCarran
Byrd	Hickenlooper	McClellan
Cain	Hill	McFarland
Capehart	Hoey	McKellar
Chavez	Holland	McMahon
Connally	Humphrey	Magnuson
Cordon	Hunt	Malone
Darby	Ives	Martin
Donnell	Jenner	Maybank
Douglas	Johnson, Colo.	Millikin
Dworschak	Johnson, Tex.	Mundt
Eastland	Johnson, S. C.	Murray
Eaton	Kefauver	O'Connor
Ellender	Kerr	O'Mahoney
Ferguson	Kilgore	Robertson
Flanders	Knowland	Russell
George		Saltonstall

Schoeppel
Smith, Maine
Smith, N. J.
Sparkman
Stennis
Taft

Taylor
Thomas, Utah
Thye
Tydings
Watkins
Wherry

Wiley
Williams
Withers
Young

Mr. McFARLAND. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BEN-TON] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LEAHY] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] is unavoidably detained on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] is absent because of a temporary illness.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is detained on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

EASTER RECESS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 193), which was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That when the House adjourns on Thursday, April 6, 1950, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian Tuesday, April 18, 1950.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House concurrent resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the acting majority leader tell us—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution is not debatable. It is a concurrent resolution providing for a House recess.

Mr. WHERRY. Does it provide only for a House recess?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It does.

Mr. WHERRY. It has nothing to do with the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Not a thing in the world, except that the Senate has to agree to it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the acting majority leader yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution is not debatable.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection to the consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the concurrent resolution is agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the acting majority leader yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. If I have the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question about the vacation over Easter, and I ask unanimous consent that I may address a question to the acting majority leader.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the acting majority leader what the plans are for the Senate. We now know what the plans are for the House. What are the plans for the Senate over Easter?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I regret very much that I am unable to answer the question. The majority leader the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] is in the city, and will be on the floor of the Senate shortly, and he will probably make the announcement.

Mr. WHERRY. I hope that the acting majority leader will get some commitment from the majority leader, because it is only 3 days to Thursday, and whether the Senate is to take a recess from Thursday to Tuesday or from Friday to Monday, or whatever it is to be, I think Senators should be advised so that they may make their plans accordingly. I hope the acting majority leader will advise the majority leader so that we may be able to know what his intentions are.

Mr. McFARLAND. The acting majority leader will advise the majority leader at the request of the minority leader.

Mr. WHERRY. And I hope that when the announcement is made it will be a positive commitment about an Easter recess.

COTTON AND PEANUT ACREAGE ALLOTMENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 540)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on pp. 4607-4608.)

Mr. AIKEN subsequently said: Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Either the Senator from Nevada or the Senator from West Virginia, whichever one wants it.

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Nevada for giving me this brief opportunity to comment on the message which has just been received from the President relative to his signing House Joint Resolution 398.

In his message the President has set forth clearly and convincingly many reasons why he should not have signed House Joint Resolution 398. However, that is not what I wish to comment on. I call the attention of Senators to the following sentence appearing in the middle of page 2 of the President's message:

I again urge the Congress to authorize a system of production payments for potatoes (and other perishable commodities) so that

unavoidable surpluses can be sold to consumers and used, instead of taken off the market and largely wasted.

It is apparent that because of President Truman's unfamiliarity with agricultural legislation he was unaware of the fact that on October 31, 1949, he signed a piece of legislation which repealed the provision of the 1948 Agricultural Act which would have taken effect on January 1, 1950, providing for a system of production payments for potatoes and other perishable commodities. I am sure the President must have been unaware of the fact that when he signed that bill on October 31 he was repealing the very provision he is asking for today. When, on January 4, he came before the joint session of the Congress and urged that Congress make provision of law for production payments I admit that I was considerably puzzled. I am even more puzzled when he repeats the request today, because at the time he signed the bill repealing this provision of the law I thought, of course, he must be opposed to production payments on perishable commodities. However, his interest seems to be in getting the unavoidable surpluses into the hands of consumers at a lower cost. I hope the President will familiarize himself with those provisions of the law now in existence which permit the Secretary of Agriculture to put surplus perishable commodities upon the market for whatever price he can get for them. There is no restriction whatever against that, Mr. President. The Secretary of Agriculture could put upon the open market all the potatoes, or part of the potatoes, which are in surplus today, so that the consumers could benefit from lower prices. If carefully handled, that would probably be preferable to letting them be destroyed. I should like at this point to read what the law says on this matter:

The Corporation—

Referring to the Commodity Credit Corporation—

shall not sell any basic agricultural commodity or storable nonbasic commodity at less than 5 percent above the current support price for such commodity, plus reasonable carrying charges. The foregoing restrictions shall not apply to . . . (D) sales of commodities which have substantially deteriorated in quality or as to which there is a danger of loss or waste through deterioration or spoilage.

The President apparently is unaware of the fact that the Secretary of Agriculture and the Commodity Credit Corporation can put on the market these potatoes and any other Government-owned perishables at any time they see fit, at whatever price they can get.

I hope the President will take notice that the Secretary does have the authority, under the law, and that he will instruct the Secretary to make surplus perishable commodities available to the people of this country. Besides potatoes, there would be butter, prunes, and many other perishable commodities which might as well be put before the consumers at reasonable prices. That is why I am at this time inviting the attention of the Senate and of the President to the existing law.

INVESTIGATION OF SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, ordinarily it would be inappropriate for a Senator who sits in a judicial capacity on a subcommittee to express conclusions before the subcommittee's studies are finished. But the repercussions from the present investigation into disloyalty charges are such that it would not be right for me to disregard the mounting damage which is being inflicted on the position of the United States abroad and on the respect here at home for the justice and efficacy of our institutions.

I therefore submit now my opinion that the present method of making public charges against individuals before a congressional committee has proved itself a very defective way of promoting loyalty, since it often besmirches the character of innocent persons, weakens the position of the United States before the world, fails to find the really dangerous individuals, and, by putting the spotlight on others, can actually increase the security of the real Communist ring-leaders. Added to all these weaknesses is the refusal to make the files available. Although justifiable in the case of the FBI files, it is disappointing that the State Department and Civil Service Commission files are also withheld. In view of the notice which these proceedings have had, this is regrettable in three ways: For the State Department, for the country, and for those individuals who are thus denied the chance to be comprehensively cleared by the same body before which they were accused.

Because the present method is so obviously unsatisfactory, I suggest that confidential investigations be made by a trained commission of 12 members, 4 to be appointed by the President, 4 by the Senate, 4 by the House, and the whole membership to be equally divided between the two parties. This would provide a check by each branch of Government and by both parties and would in all ways do a better job. I herewith introduce a bill to set up such a commission. The bill contains strong criminal penalties for violation of confidence. This method of selecting membership received the unanimous support of Congress 3 years ago and has since proved itself workable and nonpolitical.

Mr. President, it cannot be stressed too often that the sole purpose of all loyalty investigations must be to ferret out disloyal persons. It must never allow itself to be used to carry out some hidden purpose of creating a political result here at home, regardless of whether or not such a result injures the country. If such a purpose exists, it merits unreserved condemnation. We are dealing here with the foreign relations of the United States, which means all the men, women, and children of America. In such a life-and-death responsibility, there must be no politics. Mistakes have been made in the past, and they must be ruthlessly corrected.

All we can learn so far shows clearly that none of the current charges have been proven, and that everything that we know about J. Edgar Hoover and others specifically charged with insuring loyalty is such as to inspire confidence. Americans must stand together before the world menace of communism. Dangerous days are in the offing. All we need to do is to read today's newspaper stories about the prospects in Germany. Mr. President, we must look ahead.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and properly referred.

The bill (S. 3338) to provide for the establishment of a commission to investigate charges of disloyalty in the State Department, introduced by Mr. LODGE, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

DISPLACED PERSONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4567) to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous consent agreement, from now until 2 o'clock on Wednesday the time is equally divided between those who favor and those who oppose the pending displaced persons bill. The time is controlled by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], respectively.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from West Virginia.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair can recognize no Senator except the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], who, under the unanimous-consent agreement, will have to yield to any Senator who wishes to be recognized for any purpose.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I think the orderly way would be to have the first amendment read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The first amendment is automatically pending.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I wish to ask the senior Senator from West Virginia to yield 2 minutes to me, to permit me to read a brief statement.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I do not wish to yield under such circumstances, for that might cause me to lose the floor. So at the present time I do not yield as the Senator has requested, although I shall hope to be able to yield later.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Would the two Senators who have charge of the time be agreeable to having the Chair recognize Senators at this time for the purpose of permitting them to introduce bills and other measures, submit petitions, and present other routine matters for the RECORD, as is usually permitted at the beginning of a day's session, with the time so required to be charged equally to both sides?

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I shall be glad to have that done, provided unanimous consent is given for that purpose; and in that connection I shall be

glad to yield to the majority leader, to permit him to make such a motion at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I make such a motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I wish it understood that my motion includes the reservation that such matters be submitted without speeches.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred, as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES CODE RELATING TO CRIMES AND CRIMINAL PROCEDURE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," to provide basic authority for certain activities of the United States Secret Service, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LAW-ENFORCEMENT PROBLEMS RELATING TO ORGANIZED CRIME

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting drafts of proposed legislation to prohibit the shipment of gambling devices into or out of any State where the possession or use of such devices is illegal, and making interstate use of telephone, telegraph, or radio facilities for dissemination of horse-race results for illegal purposes a Federal crime (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO CITY OF MILES CITY, MONT.

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the conveyance to the city of Miles City, State of Montana, certain lands in Custer County, Mont., and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AUDIT REPORT ON THE VIRGIN ISLANDS COMPANY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on The Virgin Islands Company, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORT ON NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL RESERVE

A letter from the Chairman of the Munitions Board, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the National Industrial Reserve, dated April 1, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF NAVY CLUB

A letter from the national commandant and the national shipswriter, of the Navy Club of the United States of America, of Rockford, Ill., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the club for the calendar year 1949 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Senate Joint Resolution 2

"Joint resolution relative to the return of abducted Greek children

"Whereas reliable sources report that large numbers of Greek children have been abducted and are presently being detained in Russian satellite states; and

"Whereas the fate of these children, like that of other persons detained behind the 'iron curtain' against their will, is of concern to all freedom-loving peoples; and

"Whereas it is meet and proper that the Legislature of the State of California should express, on behalf of the people of this State, their interest in and concern for such Greek children: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is urged to request the United Nations, by appropriate resolution, to aid in securing the return of such abducted Greek children to their native land; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, urged to take such other and further action on behalf of said Greek children as may be meet and proper in the circumstances; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Secretary of the State, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 4

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the President and the Senate of the Congress of the United States in relation to H. R. 163, authorizing Sacramento Valley irrigation canals as part of the Central Valley project in California

"Whereas in 1949, at the first session of the Eighty-first Congress of the United States, a bill, H. R. 163, was introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressmen CLAIR ENGLE and HUBERT SCUDDER, of California, authorizing the inclusion in the Central Valley project of two new irrigation features, one called the Tehama-Colusa conduit and the other the Chico Canal; and

"Whereas H. R. 163 has been passed by the House of Representatives and sent to the Senate for approval and is now pending in the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; and

"Whereas there exists at the present time in the Sacramento Valley, in Tehama, Glenn, Colusa, and Butte Counties, about 250,000 acres of high-quality land devoted mainly to dry-farm production of barley and wheat which could be transformed by irrigation from the two projects provided for in H. R. 163 into highly productive land devoted to intensive and diversified types of farming; and

"Whereas it has always been intended that the Central Valley project should serve the water requirements of both the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys, despite the fact that initially the primary objective was to transfer water from the Sacramento River to the San Joaquin Valley where it was desperately needed; and

"Whereas due to greater agricultural and domestic demands and the postwar increase of population causing a serious lowering of the underground water table there is now a greater need for irrigation and replenishment of the subterranean water reservoir in the areas of Sacramento Valley not immediately served by the Sacramento River; and

"Whereas the utilization of the water of the Sacramento River for the purposes contemplated by H. R. 163 will not affect or jeopardize any of the other features of the Central Valley project; and

"Whereas the California Legislature, as early as 1941, recognized that the Central Valley project, originally a State project, should include an irrigation system such as is contemplated by H. R. 163; and

"Whereas the economic feasibility of the works contemplated by H. R. 163 cannot be questioned; and

"Whereas H. R. 163 has the unqualified endorsement of the governor, the legislature, and the division of water resources of the department of public works of the State of California, of county officials, irrigation committees and districts, and the farmers of the region to be affected, and in addition has been recommended and approved by the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Reclamation; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes and urges the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Senate, and the President of the United States to give favorable consideration to H. R. 163 at the earliest possible time in order that this legislation, so vital to the interests of the people of the State of California and of the Nation, may be put into effect without delay; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Butch Leibach Auxiliary to Post No. 4018, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, of Plentywood, Mont., signed by Evelyn Nikolaisen, legislative chairman, praying for the enactment of House bill 4617, to liberalize the requirement for payment of pension in certain cases to veterans and their widows and children; to the Committee on Finance.

Resolutions adopted by the Hawaii Farm Bureau Federation, of Honolulu, and the Volcano Farm Bureau Center, of Hawaii National Park, of Volcano, both in the Territory of Hawaii, favoring the reappointment of Ingram M. Stainback as Governor of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Ferndale (Pa.) Woman's Christian Temperance Union, protesting against the enactment of legislation providing compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The petition of Jack Webster and sundry other students of the Cleburne Rural High School, of Cleburne, Kans., relating to industrial strikes, and so forth; ordered to lie on the table.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION—RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF ALDERMEN OF SOMERVILLE, MASS.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and myself, I submit for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Board of Aldermen of the City of

Somerville, Mass., relating to Federal aid to education.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, That the members of the Board of Aldermen of the City of Somerville record themselves as favoring Federal legislation to aid education which will not exclude parochial-school children, and denounces the action of organizations opposing such benefits as discriminatory and un-American; and be it further

Resolved, That we express our wholehearted approval of the granting of such auxiliary school services as lunches, health examinations, and bus rides for the safety and health of the children attending parochial schools as well as all benefits considered essential to the benefits of all school children in all schools; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded to our United States Senators from Massachusetts and to the congressional Members representing our city in the Congress of these United States.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA AND HAWAII

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, an editorial from the Sitka, Alaska, Sentinel of March 24, 1950, and one from the New York Times of Sunday, March 13, 1950, relating to bills providing statehood for Alaska and Hawaii, now pending before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

There being no objection, the editorials were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sitka (Alaska) Sentinel]

Hawaii has elected delegates to a constitutional convention and are keeping up a constant battle to get their statehood bill passed by the Senate. A majority of Alaskans have come to the conclusion after the slight margin by which their statehood bill carried that Senate action will either be deferred, killing the bill, or that it has little or no chance of passing.

A drive should be made to change the statehood legislation to be more advantageous to the Territory, giving them more control over Government lands.

Evidently the legislation discussed during the past 2 years for statehood and the actual bill which was finally introduced into Congress have little in common. Copies of the enabling act have as yet not reached the majority of Alaskans, in fact the original plans were changed by the proponents from town to town and division to division, until the understanding of one person is not that of a resident living in a different part of the Territory.

If the Senate Interior and Public Lands committee can be persuaded to rewrite the statehood bill so that it will pass the higher chamber, we will without doubt receive statehood.

[From the New York Times]

PREREQUISITES OF STATEHOOD

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

In your editorial of March 2 you dismiss very lightly the vote of the House of Representatives to admit Alaska to statehood, though her population is only about 100,000.

As a matter of fact, the provision in the Constitution for equal representation in the Senate of small and large units was the subject of heated discussion in the Consti-

tutional Convention between the larger and smaller States.

The original 13 were sovereign States, and the smaller States contended that as such they were entitled to equal representation with the larger, and the present provision was finally adopted as a compromise to insure the ratification of the Constitution by both small and large States.

In the last 50 years, only three States have been admitted, Oklahoma in 1907 with 2,000,000 population, New Mexico with 360,000, and Arizona with 204,000. In the previous 50 years—1850 to 1900—six States with less than 100,000 were admitted. But the total population was only 23,000,000 in 1850, 31,000,000 in 1860, and in 1900, 76,000,000.

Even in the case of Hawaii, passing over the heterogeneous character of her population and the ease of a Communist infiltration (assuming it doesn't at present exist), it is a bit disingenuous for your editorial of March 7 to class Manhattan Island with Hawaii as noncontiguous territory.

Manhattan, moreover, has a much larger population than Hawaii, and while it elects Representatives to the House of Representatives, it cannot elect its own Senators, and even in its many local matters it is in many ways subject to control from Washington and Albany. Yet its interest in national and international affairs is at least as distinctive and important as Hawaii's, and those interests do not always accord with the interests of other sections of the country.

Hawaii and Alaska already have, under their Territorial organization, the right to elect their own legislatures and a Representative in Congress, who has all the privileges of membership except a vote. To these should be added by legislation the power to elect their own governor, and perhaps a representative in the Senate, with full power to introduce legislation and all other powers of a Senator except a vote. It is hard to see that it has immediate need for more.

For statehood Hawaii as well as Alaska should wait until the Constitution can be so amended that new States may elect both Senators and Representatives with voting power in the ratio that their population bears to the average population of the other States. To admit them now would be equivalent to depriving the remaining 150,000,000 of our citizens of much of their voice in the affairs of the Nation.

The four new Senators, or even one of them, might readily prevent the ratification of a treaty upon which might depend the fate of the country and indeed of the world.

MICHAEL SCHAAPE.

New York, March 9, 1950.

SOCIALIZED MEDICINE—RESOLUTION OF AMERICAN PROTESTANT HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION, CHICAGO, ILL.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, from time to time it has seemed pertinent for me to bring to the attention of the Senate resolutions and statements issued by various important groups opposing any form of socialized medicine.

Today a resolution has reached me from the American Protestant Hospital Association concerning formal action taken with regard to such a proposal, which is, it seems to me, particularly important, inasmuch as it reflects the considered opinion of a national group whose influence in the field of health is of major importance. In fact, along with the American Hospital Association and the Catholic Hospital Association, it is one of the big three in the field of hospital facilities.

While expressing its deep interest in the provision of adequate health services

for all the people of our Nation, the resolution recalls that most of the great hospital and other charitable institutions have come into being through the voluntary support of philanthropically minded men and women and cites the experience of Government plans for individual health care in other countries in the matter of uncontrollable demands upon hospitals, doctors, and other health resources, without the possibility of reasonable check and with resulting excessive cost to their people through taxation.

It was because of my personal convictions to the same effect as expressed in the resolution of the American Protestant Hospital Association that I joined with the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and other Senators in the introduction of Senate bill 1456, which would provide for a plan of voluntary health insurance in conjunction with voluntary prepayment plans already established throughout the country and in further cooperation with State and local programs for providing care for indigents.

The two vital considerations that enter into any discussion of socialized medicine are first, the question of maintenance of free American institutions, and protection of the rights of individuals to choose their own methods of care; and, secondly, the admittedly huge costs that would be entailed, costs that I am convinced would be prohibitive in the present unbalanced condition of our Federal financing.

I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that the resolution be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**AMERICAN PROTESTANT HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION
RESOLUTION ADOPTED, CHICAGO, MARCH 3,
1950**

Whereas the American Protestant Hospital Association has just completed its twenty-ninth annual convention; and

Whereas for the first time in the history of Protestantism in America the several Protestant church denominations of our country have combined their common interests in the field of Christian eleemosynary service to the aged, the orphaned, and the sick in full realization of the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God; be it

Resolved, That the convention convey its thanks to the representatives of the Protestant denominations that have assisted in making this initial effort an enjoyable and profitable conference; and be it further

Resolved, That the American Protestant Hospital Association by rising vote expresses its appreciation to Dr. L. B. Benson for the fine leadership that he has given us during his term of office; to Dr. and Mrs. Albert Hahn for their faithful and untiring efforts in the planning and promotion of the convention program and to our officers and committees and those participating in the program for their part in contributing to the enrichment of our experience and the enlargement of our knowledge. To Dr. M. T. MacEachern, president-elect, we desire to pledge our affection and loyalty and to assure him of our sincere desire to cooperate with him in his plans for the next association year; and

Whereas the American Protestant Hospital Association has over the past years main-

tained friendly, cooperative and cordial relationship with those other organizations so closely allied in interest to our own, to-wit: The American Hospital Association, the Catholic Hospital Association, the American College of Surgeons, the American Medical Association, and the American College of Hospital Administrators, and other allied organizations; be it

Resolved, That the American Protestant Hospital Association convey to each of these organizations its appreciation of these friendly relationships and expresses the hope that we may continue working together for the common good; and

Whereas the American Protestant Hospital Association is deeply interested in providing adequate health service for all the men, women, and children of our Nation; and

Whereas most of our great hospitals and other charitable institutions have been brought into being through the voluntary support of philanthropically minded men and women; and

Whereas the large majority of American families have the resources to pay for adequate medical and hospital care; and

Whereas local Government and local hospitals and the medical profession have always recognized their responsibility to those unable to care for themselves; and

Whereas it has been demonstrated by experience that government plans for individual health care in other countries have produced uncontrollable demands upon hospitals, doctors, and other health resources without the possibility of reasonable check and with resulting excessive cost to their people through taxation; and

Whereas medical-hospital related individual health services in this country are now the best in the world, a system which has developed according to the best traditions of the American character; be it

Resolved, That the American Protestant Hospital Association reemphasize its approval of the action of its officers and representatives in their efforts to develop and extend the voluntary prepayment plans such as the Blue Cross and Blue Shield plan for providing health care and authorize them to continue in their cooperation with other organizations and governmental departments providing care for indigents;

Resolved further, That the American Protestant Hospital Association restate its opposition to any system of compulsory health insurance which deprives the individual of free choice and free exercise of his own personal initiative in providing for his health care; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each Member of the Senate of the United States, and to each Member of the House of Representatives; be it further

Resolved, That a commission be appointed by the president of the American Protestant Hospital Association and concurred by the trustees, to draft an expanded statement of the position of the American Protestant Hospital Association for publication and distribution.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 118. A bill for the relief of Clemente Sabin Duplico; without amendment (Rept. No. 1379);

S. 290. A bill for the relief of Maria Franzia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1380);

S. 304. A bill for the relief of Salomon Henri Laifer; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1381);

S. 381. A bill for the relief of Low Way Hong; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1382);

S. 395. A bill for the relief of Dorothea Singer; without amendment (Rept. No. 1383);

S. 404. A bill for the relief of Emma L. Jackson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1384);

S. 583. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the estate of Archangelo Straneri; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1385);

S. 764. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Forest Lumber Co.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1386);

S. 765. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Algoma Lumber Co. and its successors in interest, George R. Kirkelund and Charles E. Siddall, of Chicago, Ill., and Kenyon T. Fay, of Los Angeles, Calif., trustees of the Algoma Lumber Liquidation Trust; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1387);

S. 766. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Lamm Lumber Co.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1388);

S. 861. A bill for the relief of Chen-Kya Hahn; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1389);

S. 891. A bill for the relief of Ronald Clive Jack; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1390);

S. 1143. A bill for the relief of Vit Komarek; without amendment (Rept. No. 1391);

S. 1214. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie Gulbenkian; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1392);

S. 1419. A bill for the relief of Wilhemus Johannes Marie Van Der Kooy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1393);

S. 1452. A bill for the relief of Dr. Juan A. Queralt Balleste; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1394);

S. 1491. A bill for the relief of Rudolf Meinhard and Irene Hallinger; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1395);

S. 1506. A bill for the relief of Andre Lan; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1396);

S. 1551. A bill for the relief of Jose Augusto Pereira; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1397);

S. 1561. A bill for the relief of Anton Bos; without amendment (Rept. No. 1398);

S. 1573. A bill for the relief of Anastacia Roshani; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1399);

S. 1672. A bill for the relief of Efrosini Abad; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1400);

S. 1693. A bill for the relief of Karin Margareta Hellen and Olof Christer Hellen; without amendment (Rept. No. 1401);

S. 1753. A bill for the relief of Zora Krizan, also known as Zorardo Krizanovna; without amendment (Rept. No. 1402);

S. 1802. A bill for the relief of Anastasios Kollias; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1403);

S. 1856. A bill for the relief of Sisters Maria Rita Rossi, Maria Domenica Paone, Rachele Orlando, Assunta Roselli, Rosa Innocenti, and Maria Mancinelli; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1404);

S. 1869. A bill for the relief of Marcantonio Doria d'Angri and his wife, Sonia Stampa Doria d'Angri; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1405);

S. 2108. A bill for the relief of Italo Vespa de Chellis; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1406);

S. 2265. A bill for the relief of Marina George Papadopoulos; without amendment (Rept. No. 1407);

S. 2714. A bill for the relief of Thomas Pfeiffer; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1408);

S. 3012. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Osa J. Petty; without amendment (Rept. No. 1409);

S. 3090. A bill for the relief of Lt. (Jg) Charles W. Ireland, Supply Corps, United States Navy, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1410);

H. R. 597. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of J. T. Melson against the United States; with amendments (Rept. No. 1411);

H. R. 1026. A bill for the relief of the estate of Susie Lee Spencer; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1412);

H. R. 1487. A bill for the relief of Lt. (sg) Giacomo Falco; without amendment (Rept. No. 1413);

H. R. 1862. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Walter K. Miyamoto (formerly Miyoko Takahashi); with amendments (Rept. No. 1414);

H. R. 2351. A bill for the relief of Aileen L. Sherwood; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1415);

H. R. 2591. A bill for the relief of Giovanna Parisi, Michelina Valletta, Yolanda Altieri, Generosa Tamburi, Carolina Picciano, and Giovanna Turtur; without amendment (Rept. No. 1416);

H. R. 2854. A bill for the relief of Wade H. Noland; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1417);

H. R. 3010. A bill for the relief of Walter E. Parks; without amendment (Rept. No. 1418);

H. R. 3462. A bill for the relief of Walter J. O'Toole; without amendment (Rept. No. 1419);

H. R. 3924. A bill for the relief of Dr. T. F. Harrison; without amendment (Rept. No. 1420);

H. R. 4342. A bill for the relief of J. R. Holden, R. C. Biggadake, and John Hoffman; without amendment (Rept. No. 1421);

H. R. 4720. A bill for the relief of Stella Avner; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1422);

H. R. 5341. A bill for the relief of Joseph W. Greer; without amendment (Rept. No. 1423);

H. R. 5704. A bill for the relief of Janis Shimada; without amendment (Rept. No. 1424);

H. R. 6003. A bill for the relief of Beulah L. White, widow of John E. White; without amendment (Rept. No. 1425);

H. R. 6093. A bill for the relief of Masami Hiroya and Aiko Hiroya; without amendment (Rept. No. 1426);

H. R. 6282. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elvor Anne-Britt Jedlund; without amendment (Rept. No. 1427);

H. R. 6283. A bill for the relief of Johnny Nielsen; without amendment (Rept. No. 1428);

H. R. 6345. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Raymond Schaffer, Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1429);

H. R. 6656. A bill for the relief of Peter Michael El-Hini; without amendment (Rept. No. 1430); and

H. Con. Res. 190. Concurrent resolution to provide for the observance and celebration of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of Patriots' Day for the commemoration of the events that took place on April 19, 1775; without amendment (Rept. No. 1431).

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 6695. A bill for the relief of Edgar F. Russell; Lillian V. Russell, his wife; and Bessie R. Ward; without amendment (Rept. No. 1377); and

H. R. 6696. A bill for the relief of Lawrence B. Williams and his wife, Viva Craig Williams; without amendment (Rept. No. 1378).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 356. A bill for the relief of Hugo Geiger; without amendment (Rept. No. 1376).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. LODGE introduced Senate bill 3338, to provide for the establishment of a com-

mission to investigate charges of disloyalty in the State Department, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. TAFT introduced Senate bill 3339, to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 3340. A bill for the relief of Sara-Feiga Ruzsniowska;

S. 3341. A bill for the relief of Paddy Keng Wing Chow; and

S. 3342. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Michel Spellman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. LANGER introduced Senate bill 3343, to provide for election of postmasters by the people, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 3344. A bill for the relief of Walter L. Monson; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 3345. A bill for the relief of Humayag Dildilian and his family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 3346. A bill for the relief of Carmencita von Plettenberg and Erich Paysen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNT:

S. 3347. A bill to regulate the height, exterior design, and construction of private and semipublic buildings in the Georgetown area of the National Capital; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 3348. A bill for the relief of Kue Hin Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENDRICKSON (for himself and Mr. KEFAUVER):

S. 3349. A bill to amend the Architects' Registration Act for the District of Columbia in order to safeguard life, health, and property, and to promote the public welfare; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT OF LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT OF 1947

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, and for other purposes, to carry out my ideas of what should be done in that field.

The bill (S. 3339) to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. TAFT, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

ELECTION OF POSTMASTERS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for election of postmasters by the people. It should convince the public at large that if the bill is passed, it will prevent the concentration of power in Washington.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3343) to provide for election of postmasters by the people, introduced by Mr. LANGER, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. LANGER subsequently said: Mr. President, I desire to refer for just a moment in the bill which I introduced this morning, dealing with the matter

of an editorial which appeared in the Washington Star on Saturday, which stated that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service apparently had done something entirely wrong in refusing to report a bill which provided that 22,000 postmasters could be appointed hereafter by the Postmaster General—which of course would mean the President—without confirmation by the Senate, and which intimated that the action of the committee was inspired by the fact that Senators had something to say about the postmasters, which was classified as patronage.

Mr. President, from all over the Northwest, in which I live, cries have come in to take the power away from Washington and to place it back in the hands of the people, where it belongs. Manifestly, if the President, through the Postmaster General, is going to overturn a precedent which has stood for over a century, and which has always required that postmasters shall be confirmed by the Senate, some good reason ought to be shown for it; and certainly no such good reason was shown to our committee. But, in order to do away forever with the cry that members of the committee were trying to retain patronage, this morning I introduced a bill providing that the Postmaster General shall lay down rules and regulations under which the patrons of the post office shall elect the postmaster out of the three highest applicants certified by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

For one, I say it is time that we took from Washington a centralization of power whereby it is possible for Washington bureaucrats to go into every village and hamlet and there name the postmaster; who in many instances is the very last person the people of the particular municipality would select for postmaster. I can cite numerous instances, and shall do so later, when the bill is reported, wherein acting postmasters have been appointed for periods of 1, 2, or 3 years, wherein veterans' preference has been entirely ignored and politicians placed in charge by the Postmaster General—I say at the request of the President, or of the Democratic National Committee, or of the Republican National Committee.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 12 OF 1950

Mr. TAFT submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 248), which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

Resolved, That the Senate does not favor the Reorganization Plan No. 12 of 1950 transmitted to Congress by the President on March 13, 1950.

CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS—AMENDMENT

Mr. CAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 5472) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS INTO THE UNITED STATES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. CAIN submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4567) to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. CAIN also submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by Mr. KILGORE (for himself and other Senators) to House bill 4567, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. KNOWLAND submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 4567, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. JENNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by Mr. KILGORE (for himself and other Senators) to House bill 4567, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. WITHERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by Mr. KILGORE (for himself and other Senators) to House bill 4567, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. McCARRAN submitted 14 amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 4567, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

EXTENSION OF OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE SYSTEM—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], I submit for appropriate reference, amendments intended to be proposed by us to the bill (H. R. 6000) to extend and improve the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance System, to amend the public-assistance and child-welfare provisions of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes.

The amendment would expand the scope of the pension provisions to a more realistic level.

I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to have printed the text of the amendments, which is very brief, and an explanatory statement by me in the body of the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Finance, and, without objection, the amendments and explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendments and explanatory statement are as follows:

AMENDMENT INTENDED TO BE PROPOSED BY MR. LEHMAN, MR. MURRAY, AND MR. HUMPHREY TO H. R. 6000

1. On page 64, in subsection (b) of section 215, delete the words "10 percent of the next \$200 of such wage" and insert in lieu thereof the words "15 percent of the next \$300 of such wage".

2. On page 64, in clause (2) of the subsection (a) of section 215, delete the words "one-half of".

3. In title I of the bill (amending title II of the Social Security Act) substitute "\$4,800" for "\$3,600" wherever the latter occurs.

4. In title II of the bill (amending the Internal Revenue Code) substitute "\$4,800" for "\$3,600" wherever the latter occurs.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HERBERT H. LEHMAN IN REGARD TO AMENDMENTS TO INCREASE OLD-AGE AND OTHER PENSIONS UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY (H. R. 6000)

In association with Senator MURRAY and Senator HUMPHREY, I am today submitting amendments to the pending social-security bill, H. R. 6000, to increase the insurance benefits to retired persons, widows and orphans. The amendment would increase insurance benefits an additional \$10 to \$20 a month per insured worker on the average. For example, under my amendment an average industrial worker earning \$200 a month who had contributed 20 years under the insurance system would receive a retirement benefit of \$117 a month for himself and his wife instead of \$99 as provided in H. R. 6000.

If the amendment I have offered is enacted into law, it will not only be of great help to thousands of families in the State of New York but to millions of families throughout the entire Nation. Over 325,000 individuals are now receiving insurance benefits in New York State and over 2,800,000 in the Nation. Thousands of additional persons will become eligible for insurance benefits each year by H. R. 6000 and every one of these persons would benefit by the passage of the amendment.

H. R. 6000 increases the insurance benefits above the grossly inadequate amounts now being paid. However, the improvements made by the pending bill do not go far enough in my opinion, to meet the needs of our people. The hearings now being held by the Senate Committee on Finance have indicated both the need for further increases in the insurance benefits and the overwhelming support of numerous groups for further increases.

Representatives of the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and employer and insurance organizations have testified before the committee in favor of some further increases. While there has been a difference of opinion as to how these increases should be made and how much they should be, it is important to note that all of these organizations agree that further increases in H. R. 6000 are essential.

I believe that the principle of contributory social insurance with benefits related to prior earnings and to the length of time an insured individual has contributed to the system is a sound American way of meeting the problem. Differential benefits based on wages are a reward for productive effort and are consistent with the economic philosophy of our incentive economy.

Under our social insurance system, an individual earns the right to a benefit related to his own contribution to production. I believe that this principle should be further emphasized by assuring more adequate differentials to the middle-income earners who form the backbone of our incentive economy. In my opinion the benefits provided in H. R. 6000 do not provide sufficiently for differentials between various contributors. If we wish to retain a truly American plan of contributory insurance we must assure those who earn more—and contribute more—a more realistic and more adequate benefit.

The following table shows how the amendments which I am introducing would increase insurance benefits for various illustrative cases.

The following tables show that the percentage of wages compensated under H. R.

6000 for a man with 20 years of contributions varies from 55 to only 19 percent. Under my amendment a more realistic variation would be achieved from 60 to 28.5 percent. It should be noted that under my proposed amendment there is still sufficient room for private supplementation of these benefits.

Benefit amounts and percentage replacement of wage under H. R. 6000 and proposed amendment

A. BENEFITS FOR RETIRED SINGLE MAN

Average monthly wage	H. R. 6000		Proposed amendment	
	Benefit amount	Benefit as percent of wage	Benefit amount	Benefit as percent of wage
5 years of coverage				
\$100.....	\$51.30	51.3	\$52.50	52.5
\$200.....	61.50	30.8	68.30	34.2
\$300.....	71.80	23.9	84.00	28.0
\$400.....	71.80	18.0	99.80	25.0
20 years of coverage				
\$100.....	\$55.00	55.0	\$60.00	60.0
\$200.....	66.00	33.0	78.00	39.0
\$300.....	77.00	25.7	96.00	32.0
\$400.....	77.00	19.3	114.00	28.5

B. BENEFITS FOR RETIRED MAN AND WIFE

5 years of coverage				
\$100.....	\$77.00	77.0	\$78.80	78.8
\$200.....	92.30	46.2	102.50	51.3
\$300.....	107.70	35.9	123.00	41.0
\$400.....	107.70	26.9	149.70	37.4
20 years of coverage				
\$100.....	\$80.00	80.0	\$80.00	80.0
\$200.....	99.00	49.5	117.00	58.5
\$300.....	115.50	38.5	144.00	48.0
\$400.....	115.50	28.9	150.00	37.5

Section 1 of the amendment increases the maximum amount of wages on which benefits are based from \$3,600 a year to \$4,800 a year, and increases the basic benefit in relation to monthly wages above \$100. H. R. 6000 provides for a basic benefit amounting to 50 percent of the first \$100 of average monthly wage and 10 percent of the next \$200 whereas the amendment provides for a basic benefit amounting to 50 percent of the first \$100 and 15 percent of the next \$300.

Section 2 of the amendment would change the annual increment in the benefit formula—that is, the amount by which the basic benefit is increased for each year of coverage—from one-half of 1 percent to the full 1 percent as is provided in existing law.

Section 3 of the amendment would merely provide for crediting wages up to \$4,800 a year rather than \$3,600 as in H. R. 6000; this is necessary to carry out the purpose of section 1. Similarly, section 4 of the amendment would make the contribution provisions applicable to wages of \$4,800 a year rather than \$3,600.

HOUSE BILL PLACED ON CALENDAR

The bill (H. R. 7797) to provide foreign economic assistance, was read twice by its title, and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

JOHN JOSEPH MCKAY

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 212) for the relief of John Joseph McKay, which

was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That in the administration of the immigration laws the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record John Joseph McKay, of Deer Lodge, Mont., as having entered the United States on April 5, 1947, for permanent residence, upon payment by him of the required visa fee and head tax.

SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for Portugal of the first year that such quota number is available.

Mr. McCARRAN. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

JACKSON RILEY HOLLAND

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2084) for the relief of Jackson Riley Holland, which were, in line 4, after "laws," insert "the alien"; in line 7, after "the," insert "natural-born," and to strike out all after "Holland" in line 8 down to and including "immigrant" in line 10.

Mr. McCARRAN. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Charles Fahy, of New Mexico, to be a judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit;

William Lee Knous, of Colorado, to be United States district judge for the district of Colorado, vice John Foster Symes, retiring;

Burnita Shelton Matthews, of the District of Columbia, to be United States district judge for the District of Columbia. (She is now serving under a recess appointment.)

Irving R. Kaufman, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York. (He is now serving under a recess appointment.)

Allan K. Grim, of Pennsylvania, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania. (He is now serving under a recess appointment.)

Irving H. Saypol, of New York, to be United States attorney for the southern district of New York, vice John F. X. McGohey, elevated; and

William A. Carroll, of New York, to be United States marshal for the southern district of New York, vice James E. Mulcahy, resigned.

By Mr. JENNER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

William E. Steckler, of Indiana, to be United States district judge for the southern district of Indiana, vice Robert C. Baltzell, retired.

REORGANIZATION PLANS OF 1950

[Mr. McCLELLAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD memorandums compiled by the staff of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments on the 21 reorganization plans submitted to Congress by the President on March 13, 1950, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE DAIRY INDUSTRY IN NEW YORK—ADDRESS BY SENATOR LEHMAN

[Mr. LEHMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the Northeastern Dairy Conference, meeting in their fifteenth annual session, which appears in the Appendix.]

A PROGRAM FOR THE REPUBLICAN PARTY—ADDRESS BY GUY G. GABRIELSON, REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CHAIRMAN

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Mr. Guy G. Gabrielson, chairman of the Republican National Committee, at a conference of midwestern and Rocky Mountain Republican State chairmen, at Salt Lake City, Utah, March 31, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

DISPLACED PERSONS — NEWSPAPER COMMENT

[Mr. SALTONSTALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "I Have Found Freedom," published in the Holyoke (Mass.) Transcript-Telegram of November 26, 1949; an article entitled "German Refugees Are Glad They Are Far From Munich," published in the Fall River (Mass.) Herald-News of June 10, 1949, and an editorial entitled "Displaced Persons," published in the North Adams (Mass.) Transcript on May 25, 1949, which appear in the Appendix.]

BLOW TO REORGANIZATION—EDITORIAL FROM THE EVENING STAR

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Blow to Reorganization," published in the Washington Evening Star, April 1, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

PENNSYLVANIA STILL OIL STATE—EDITORIAL FROM THE OIL CITY DERRICK

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Pennsylvania Still Oil State," published in the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of March 31, which appears in the Appendix.]

CHANGE IN METHOD OF ELECTING PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT—ARTICLE BY BLANCHARD RANDALL

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Some Observations and Comments on the Proposed Amendment to the Constitution of the United States To Change the Method of Electing a President and a Vice President," by Blanchard Randall, which appears in the Appendix.]

MORTGAGES FOR COOPERATIVE HOUSING—ARTICLE FROM THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

[Mr. BRICKER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled, "FHA Says It Will Insure Mortgages for Cooperative Housing," published in the Wall Street Journal, March 30, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONFUSION RESULTING FROM ATTACKS ON THE GOVERNMENT—BIPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to make a 2-minute statement in connection with the insertion of an article which appeared in yesterday's Star.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks an article by Mr. Constantine Brown which appeared in the Washington Star of Sunday, April 2, under the heading "Attacks on Government Leave Public Confused."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, judging by the letters I have received from my own constituents, I have found Mr. Brown's analysis the best I have seen. It points up the uncertainties in the average citizen's thinking as to what is happening to us in this critical period, and it shows the need for a positive attitude in the highest levels of our Government to reassure our people and restore their confidence.

I shall not discuss in detail the various factors that are contributing to the unsettled state of the public mind, except to mention two. One is the current investigation by the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. I believe that public fears as to the possible presence of subversive elements in our State Department will not be allayed unless the subcommittee has an opportunity to examine the secret loyalty files. It seems to me the President should have enough confidence in the distinguished members of this committee, of both parties, to permit them to examine these files in executive session, if necessary in the Department of Justice itself, or at any place the President may suggest.

I believe that such a confidential inspection of the files, and a considered and responsible report by the subcommittee, would do much to allay the fear and uncertainty which now exist.

Let me touch upon another point also. I have a strong conviction that we must restore a workable bipartisan foreign policy in which our beloved and distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], has been such an ardent and able leader in the past. We cannot find the answers to our complex foreign policies without this reasonable, united approach. Such a policy does not mean that we may not vigorously debate and test the issues here. It means that we must confine ourselves to issues, and must eliminate personalities and partisanship. In this connection, I was very much disappointed, Mr. President, that no Republican was invited to participate in the current defense discussions by signers of the North Atlantic Treaty.

Mr. President, the American people are eager to make any sacrifice to win the peace. Their elected representatives and leaders have a solemn obligation to help create the spirit and the atmosphere in which confidence and understanding are developed. They cannot be present where there is secrecy. They do not grow out of unnecessary and bickering partisanship. Charges and counter-charges do not produce them.

Our great need is for a leadership that speaks for the common aspirations and the common devotion of our people.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Star of April 2, 1950]

ATTACKS ON GOVERNMENT LEAVE PUBLIC CONFUSED—ANALYST SAYS MAN IN STREET NOW WONDERING WHETHER OUR FAILURE TO ACHIEVE PEACE ISN'T FAULT OF FEDERAL OFFICIALS

(By Constantine Brown)

The mail of Senators and Representatives has been heavy in the last few weeks.

Citizens who write to their lawmakers show puzzlement and concern over what is going on in Washington. They cannot understand the contradictions, the charges, and counter-charges which are flying between the executive and legislative branches of the Government.

The confusion which exists today in the minds of many Americans is not hard to understand. They hear that the Government—and particularly the most sensitive branches of the administration—is packed with persons who either are of questionable loyalty or perverts.

They hear from the lips of the Secretary of Defense the statement—echoed by the Commander in Chief—that at no time during peace have we been better prepared militarily than we are today. Then they hear men of high caliber and great responsibility—such as Air Force Secretary Symington and General Eisenhower—state publicly that our defense forces are below the safe point.

In the last few weeks they have heard over the radio and read in the papers charges by Senator McCARTHY that the State Department is filled with disloyal characters and persons who, in some cases, are outright agents of Russia.

PERVERTS POOR RISKS

The public does not know much about the complexities of the work of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and wonders why this agency, which is more trusted than any other in the Government, does not "go after those guys." What the public does not know is that the FBI merely investigates and puts all the evidence received in secret files which cannot be made available unless the President orders it. It cannot go after any one in a loyalty case unless it receives the green light from the Chief Executive.

The trial of Alger Hiss showed clearly that the FBI knew all about him for years before his Communist connections were uncovered by an investigation of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. But it had to keep silent until an actual case was developed in the law courts and the evidence gathered by the G-men had to be presented in court.

The unexpectedly large number of perverts dismissed from the State Department also worries the public, it appears from the mail which the lawmakers are receiving daily. Such persons are the worst kind of security risk.

After VE-day American intelligence officers discovered the secret files of German espionage headquarters, which had been headed by Admiral Canaris. This German officer, who was tortured before being executed in

1944 for his part in the attempt to assassinate Hitler, was considered by the heads of American, British, and French intelligence to be the ablest worker in the field of espionage.

Admiral Canaris' files showed that he had carefully catalogued all the homosexuals in Government positions in enemy countries. Opposite their names were notations as to whether they were addicted to narcotics or alcohol, vices which often accompany sexual perversion.

All such persons potentially are prime material as espionage agents. Once enmeshed in any kind of espionage they cannot get out for fear of being exposed. The Soviet intelligence system, which for many years was patterned after the German system, is believed to have accurate files of perverts in the American Government and has used them successfully for a number of years. As a matter of fact, the Nazi and Russian espionage systems worked together in the United States until June 1941 when Hitler attacked Russia.

PUBLIC BLAMES POLICIES

The average citizen went on a spree of optimism after World War II. He wants to have explained to him how it happened that after vast sacrifices in lives and money to win spectacularly the most devastating war in history, we appear actually to have lost it.

He knows that we are now on the defensive. He sees that the United Nations, on which American citizenry placed all its hopes for lasting peace, now is running on three cylinders. He is being told that the Soviet leaders are waging a successful cold war all over the world and that Americans do not like any kind of war. He still fails to understand why, after contributing so lavishly to victory against the Axis, we are faced with the possibility of another war with Russia.

The American man-in-the-street also knows that we have not been stingy, either during the war or after its end, in handing over our wealth to our allies.

Many Americans have come to the conclusion that our policies are wrong. Even moderately shrewd horse traders certainly would have managed to obtain a peace which lasted as long as that between World Wars I and II. And since policies are made by men it has become increasingly clear that those entrusted with making them for the United States must have made some tragic blunders.

The Hiss case apparently has made a deep impression on the people. Hiss, who was convicted of perjury, was an important policy planner in the State Department. He did not make policies; those are made by the President and Secretary of State. But the planners, who generally remain out of the limelight, are the digestive tract of the policy makers. They draft and present briefs to the men who make policy, and since they are specialists in particular fields, the Secretary of State, who often has only a perfunctory knowledge of details, is guided in accordance with the briefing he receives from his planners.

The most typical example of how specialists influence the thinking of policy makers is to be found in China. Secretaries of State Byrnes, Marshall, and Acheson were guided by the briefing of their far-eastern experts. They had been told that the Chinese Communists were nothing but agrarian reformers, who had nothing in common with Moscow.

This contention of the planners seemed correct to Mr. Acheson's predecessors. They knew that the shrewd Stalin had made light of the Chinese Communists, both at Yalta and Potsdam, comparing them to American Communists in their inefficiency as party workers. Moreover, the Soviet dictator had assured President Roosevelt at Yalta that he was willing to help Chiang Kai-shek and

pretended to keep his word by signing a treaty of friendship with the Nationalist leader a few months later.

CHINA'S CASE REVIEWED

The far-eastern planners assured their politically minded superiors that during the days of global democracy (which, by courtesy, included Russia until the cold war started) America would not be true to its Jeffersonian principles if it continued to support the venal archaic Nationalist regime. Friends of these planners on the radio and in the press took up this cry and kept harping on the stupidity of supporting Chiang's decadent regime.

Some top policy makers, including President Truman himself, may have had misgivings about that policy at a time when parts of China, at least, could have been saved from Moscow's domination. But they preferred to listen to the planners with devastating results for our security in the Pacific.

A similar situation existed before we befogged our policy in China, with respect to some parts of Europe. It was not until late 1946 that the planners began to suspect that Russia might not be entirely on the level and might seek some unwarranted territorial aggrandisement. Up to that time all of our peace plans were made with superb confidence, which was characteristic of some State Department official who were transferred from wartime agencies, that Russia would play ball to the end.

There were plenty of indications that the Russian leopard had not changed his spots. The advice from wiser men was discarded as coming from reactionaries who had the wrong slant on the New World and wanted to create trouble with the heroes of Stalingrad. Even the devious tricks of the Soviet leaders, particularly after the love feasts at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam, were not taken as evidence that the U. S. S. R.'s leaders like to stretch the written agreement.

BLANKET INDICTMENT UNFAIR

Human beings make events. And the human beings who conducted the foreign affairs of the United States during and since the war have failed not only their fellow citizens but also the rest of the peace-hungry world as well.

These are facts which have permeated the minds of many Americans who still cannot understand what makes our officials act as they do. The American people won them a full victory. All they had to do was transform that military feat into a lasting peace. Why did they blunder when they had most of the trumps?

To the average American it seems incredible that it was sheer stupidity that cost us the fruits of victory and that we now must gird ourselves to face a ruthless and unscrupulous enemy. In the light of what has been disclosed in recent months, there is a growing suspicion that we have been the victims of something more than carelessness on the part of those who organized our diplomacy during and after the war.

It is cruelly unfair, of course, to blanket in the general indictment the many honest and responsible men who have spent the best years of their lives in the service of the State Department, working hard to live up to the new responsibility which they know America has to shoulder.

Unfortunately, the public makes no distinction, once it is convinced that something definitely has gone wrong. And today the man in the street, who has more direct contact with his Congressman than he has with officials of the executive branch, wants to know what has happened to get us into the present critical situation, who is responsible for the predicament and why has the big broom not been applied to those Government departments where incompetents, freaks, and disloyal persons still hold forth.

**"CLEAN" MUNDT BILL—EDITORIAL FROM
THE WASHINGTON POST**

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post this morning entitled "Clean Mundt Bill." I call the attention of Senators to the fact that it argues in favor of the minority report which I filed.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"CLEAN" MUNDT BILL

The new version of the Mundt Communist registration bill reported out by the Senate Judiciary Committee has been cleaned up in several particulars. Even after the lavish applications of soap it has had, however, it still entails sweeping and arbitrary invasions of American liberties unwarranted by the acknowledged threat of subversion. Furthermore, it is dangerous on another count. Although its announced purpose is to force the Communists to operate in the open, its probable effect would be quite the opposite.

Like its predecessor, the new Mundt bill would set up a three-man Subversive Activities Control Board with tremendous powers to decide, without any definite criteria, whether groups were Communist political organizations or Communist-front organizations. All such organizations would be required to register with the Attorney General and maintain accurate lists of their membership; in the case of Communist political organizations the names of members would be made public.

The bill would, of course, prohibit members of Communist organizations from holding any Government job. In addition, it would deny use of the mails or radio broadcasting facilities to any registered group unless the material were plainly marked as coming from a Communist source. It would make it illegal for any member of a Communist political organization to apply for or use a passport. Finally, it would make it a crime for anyone knowingly to conspire or agree with any other persons to perform any act which would substantially contribute to the establishment within the United States of a totalitarian dictatorship. Curiously enough, under a new provision of the bill, membership in a Communist organization is not to be construed as a violation of this provision.

Many of the objections to this procedure are obvious. A Government board would have well-nigh absolute powers to tell private American citizens what groups they could join without ineradicable stigma. The criminal provisions are so vague as to open the door to great abuse. What, precisely, is any act which would substantially contribute to the establishment of dictatorship? Could it be, to use a far-fetched example, the one-party system in the South? Moreover, as the Department of Justice has pointed out in a letter to Chairman Wood of the House Un-American Activities Committee:

"A world of difference exists, from the standpoint of sound policy and constitutional validity, between making, as the bill would, membership in an organization designated by the Attorney General a felony, and recognizing such membership, as does the employee loyalty program under Executive Order 9835, as merely one piece of evidence pointing to possible disloyalty. The bill would brand the member of a listed organization a felon, no matter how innocent his membership; the loyalty program enables the member to respond to charges against

him and to show, in a manner consistent with American concepts of justice and fairness, that his membership is innocent and does not reflect upon his loyalty."

Although the bill goes to great lengths to avoid the formal outlawing of the Communist Party, for practical purposes it would accomplish just that. It would make membership in Communist organizations without registration a crime. This is not the traditional American approach, which requires the commission of an overt act of subversion before a person can be adjudged guilty of subversion. It is reminiscent of the thought control which used to arouse such mirth among Americans when it was introduced in prewar Japan.

In another category the Mundt bill is of dubious constitutionality. If the conviction of the 11 Communists under the Smith Act, which makes it a crime to advocate the overthrow of the Government by force or violence, is upheld in the forthcoming court test, then membership in the Communist Party will per se be evidence of such advocacy. In that case registration under the Mundt bill would amount to compulsory self-incrimination.

If the Mundt bill actually would accomplish the purpose of forcing the Communists into the open and protecting the integrity of the Government, that would be one thing. But should anyone in this day and age be deluded that the really dangerous Communists are those who go by that name and hold party cards. Surely the Kremlin's masterminds are persons who shun party meetings and even are known as anti-Communists. The restrictive features of the Mundt bill would only serve to push beneath the surface the visible portion of the Communist Party, which, like an iceberg, is six-sevenths submerged anyway. In this it would make inordinately more difficult the work of the FBI.

**WHAT THE REPUBLICAN PARTY STANDS
FOR—STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMITH
OF MAINE**

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, on somewhat rare occasions when our presiding officer descends from Mount Olympus to discuss mundane affairs he has asked, "What does the Republican Party stand for?" I therefore ask unanimous consent for the insertion in the RECORD at this point of a 100-word statement of Republican aims and policies, prepared primarily by my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH].

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The national Republican senatorial and congressional committees, with the Republican National Committee concurring, tonight made public a 99-word, 10-point digest of the statement of Republican principles and objectives which was adopted February 6, 1950, supplementing the 1948 Republican platform. The digest was prepared at the direction of Senator OWEN BREWSTER, of Maine, chairman of the Republican senatorial committee, and Representative LEONARD W. HALL, of New York, chairman of the republican congressional committee, with the cooperation of Guy G. Gabrielson, chairman of the Republican National Committee. It grew out of a suggestion by Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, of Maine, who was consulted in its preparation. The three GOP committees intend to use the digest in campaign material during 1950, and it is expected that Republican candidates will incorporate it into their campaign pamphlets.

The digest follows:

"DIGEST OF STATEMENT OF REPUBLICAN PRINCIPLES AND OBJECTIVES, SUPPLEMENTING 1948 REPUBLICAN PLATFORM, ADOPTED FEBRUARY 6, 1950"

"The Republican Party stands for—

"1. Reducing taxes.

"2. Balancing budget.

"3. Eliminating Government waste, especially along lines of Hoover Commission reports.

"4. Fighting communism here instead of condoning it.

"5. Providing fair market prices on farm products aided by price supports—cooperative marketing, soil conservation, reclamation, rural electrification—no Brannan plan.

"6. Continuing and improving Taft-Hartley law to protect public from excessive power of labor and management.

"7. Developing an adequate social security system that does not limit opportunity nor discourage initiative and saving.

"8. Protecting rights of veterans and minorities.

"9. Developing a united American foreign policy for peace—world trade without undermining American living standards.

"10. Safeguard liberty against socialism."

**PROPOSED INCREASE IN BORROWING
POWER OF THE COMMODITY CREDIT
CORPORATION**

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any further routine matters?

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, if there are no further routine matters, I desire to yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I deem it very urgent that the Senate act as soon as possible on the bill, H. R. 6567, an act to increase the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation. As we were just advised, the House will recess on April 6 and will remain in recess until the 18th, and if the bill should be passed this week, it means that the Senate and House will have to go into conference. I should like to propose a unanimous-consent agreement that at 4 o'clock today, the pending measure be set aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. R. 6567.

Mr. KILGORE. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I desire to propose another unanimous-consent agreement relative to the same measure. I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow at 4 o'clock the pending measure be set aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. R. 6567.

Mr. KILGORE. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

DISPLACED PERSONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4567) to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I yield 25 minutes to the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The senior Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, in speaking on the displaced persons bill, I want to sum up the situation in which we find ourselves. There are

before us the bill and the committee report, which we are now considering, with amendments. I am a member of a group offering a substitute bill, which will come up later in the debate. I want to point out in connection with the first three amendments which we are taking up together, that my whole approach to this subject of the definition of displaced persons is based on my conception of the responsibility of the United States for the displaced-persons problem as it presents itself to us through our responsibilities in Germany, in the western sphere, where we have established displaced-persons camps.

As I see the problem, if we confuse that particular responsibility with any extraneous circumstances or conditions in Europe, we are apt to get away from the main objective.

I shall continue, Mr. President, with my prepared remarks. I do not know whether, in connection with my remarks, there will be questions, but I request that I be not interrupted until I conclude my prepared statement. Then, if there is time for questions, I shall be glad to answer them.

Mr. President, my remarks at this time are directed to the first three committee amendments to House bill 4567, running from page 1, line 3, to page 5, line 12. These committee amendments would entirely change the definitions of displaced person and eligible displaced person. That is why I am opposing these amendments in the committee report.

As I shall seek to show, in my judgment these amendments would completely change the nature of the displaced-persons program and make it impossible for the United States to fulfill its international obligation and its moral commitment toward the original group of displaced persons. It was that original group of displaced persons that first started us to think in terms of legislation in connection with the problem. I shall also seek to show that this change would raise false hopes in the minds of millions of so-called ethnic Germans—hopes which would be almost completely frustrated under the terms of the bill itself. I therefore hope the Senate will reject the amendments. The other problem involved is a worthy one, but, in my judgment, it has nothing to do with the displaced-persons problem.

Before I discuss this matter in detail, I should like to point out that I have taken a keen interest in the problem of European displaced persons for 3 years past. Early in 1947 I supported ratification of the Constitution of the International Refugee Organization as an arm of the United Nations, and I had an active part in the selection of my esteemed friend, the Honorable William Hallam Tuck, to head the Preparatory Commission, known as PCIRO, in July 1947. As all Senators know, he was later elected Director General of the IRO itself when that organization was fully established. He gave splendid leadership in the early days of this great international humanitarian movement. I may say, Mr. President, that it was a matter of great regret to me when Mr.

Tuck saw fit to retire, for he had laid a great foundation for the work.

In order that we may have clearly in mind the nature of the movement to resettle the displaced persons, and particularly the obligation of the United States, let me review in a few words the origin and history of this problem.

It is estimated that some 8,000,000 eastern Europeans were uprooted from their homes in the course of World War II. I like to think of that figure of 8,000,000, because we got approximately 7,000,000 persons back, which left the figure approximately 1,000,000 persons to deal with in the western zone of Germany where we felt the responsibility and where our occupation facilities took care of them. Most of these were liberated in Germany by the advance of the Allied armies in 1945. During 1945 and 1946 the vast majority of these uprooted people, for the most part inmates of Nazi slave-labor camps and concentration camps, had been returned to their countries of origin through the agency of the Allied armies, with the help of other relief agencies. That is where our responsibility lay as an occupying power.

But this rapid process of repatriation came to a halt in 1947, when the communization of all eastern Europe had deprived most of the remaining DP's of any desire to return to their homelands. At the beginning of 1948 some 837,000 DP's remained in western Germany, western Austria, and Italy.

It was our policy not to return any refugee to his country of origin against his will, and I am sure all Senators will agree that no other policy would have been in accord with our traditional American beliefs.

Therefore, Mr. President, these 837,000 displaced persons remained at the start of 1948 under the jurisdiction of the international refugee organization.

About 611,000 of them were being cared for in displaced persons camps. Since the end of hostilities they had been first under the care of the Allied forces, then of UNRRA and other interim agencies, and finally from July 1, 1947, when the IRO Preparatory Commission began operations, these people were all under the care of that body and its successor, the IRO itself.

Mr. President, this has necessarily been a very costly operation. The direct cost to the United States in contributions to the IRO alone during the present fiscal year has been \$70,448,000. Of the total some \$350,000,000 which the IRO expects to have spent by June 30 of this year, by far the largest part has been contributed by the United States. I want to emphasize that figure of \$70,448,000. It illustrates the load which has been on us annually for some time, except as it is reduced by taking persons out of the camps and resettling them.

From the facts I have thus far mentioned, I think it is clear that the overwhelming majority of the DP's could not be repatriated, that is, sent back to their homes, because of the conditions of tyranny and oppression prevailing in their homelands; and further, that it would have served no conceivable pur-

pose to maintain them permanently in IRO camps, largely at the expense of the American taxpayer. There were two approaches, therefore—repatriation, so far as we could get them to go back, or to leave them in these camps, where we had to pay for them. We had a problem we had to meet. And let me observe here that in the summer of 1947, when this very problem was before Congress, I had the privilege as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee of visiting several of these IRO camps in Germany with Mr. Tuck, the director, and members of General Clay's staff. I may say I talked the matter over fully with General Clay. It was at that time that I received a most encouraging impression of the character of these DP's and of their allegiance to democracy through sad experience with Hitlerism. The camps were governed democratically by the DP's themselves, and I found them for the most part industrious, self-reliant, courageous people who had suffered untold misfortunes at the hands of the Nazis.

These were people who had the courage not to go back to their homes and accept the jurisdiction being put over them there. Consequently, they had to accept the position of being homeless, displaced persons, with the hope that some disposition might be made for them in areas of the world where democratic principles prevailed.

Since we could neither repatriate all these people nor forever support them in the unproductive and makeshift setting of the camps, the question then arose whether there was any hope that they could be established in the German economy. This theoretical possibility was discarded for two reasons—first, because these people were non-Germans whose sufferings at the hands of the Germans made it almost certain that their resettlement in Germany would cause great friction for a long time—settling them in Germany did not seem to be a possibility; and, second, because western Germany was already greatly overpopulated by an influx of millions of German-speaking refugees from the east.

For these reasons it was unanimously agreed by the IRO countries, including the United States, that the only fair and workable solution was resettlement in any part of the world where we could place these unfortunate people. To be sure, the IRO has constantly encouraged the absorption of DP's in the German, Austrian, and Italian economies despite all the obstacles, and has likewise cooperated in the voluntary repatriation of all DP's who freely chose to return to their homelands.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'Connor in the chair). Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I have requested, because of the limited time, that I be permitted to finish my prepared statement. I shall be glad to yield if there is time after I conclude.

In the 2 years ending June 30, 1949, the IRO repatriated 64,893 of its charges and expects to return another 15,000 in

the current fiscal year. These are figures which have come from the State Department and the IRO organization. But it was clear from the beginning that the vast majority would have to be resettled in the countries affiliated with the IRO or in other countries outside of Europe.

At this point in my remarks I ask unanimous consent to have inserted a statement which I made in my original report to the Committee on Foreign Relations on my return from Europe in 1947, what appears on pages 2 and 3 of my report, under the heading "Fundamental facts and conclusions as to the displaced-persons problem," in which I sum up in 8 paragraphs the situation in which we found ourselves at that stage of the development of our work. I do not think I need read this, but I want it in the RECORD to show clearly how this whole matter was developed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FUNDAMENTAL FACTS AND CONCLUSIONS AS TO THE DISPLACED-PERSONS PROBLEM

From the reports of the subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee and of the subcommittee of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and from the testimony of the Secretary of State and the then Secretary of War and their assistants and advisers engaged directly on the displaced-persons problem, and from my own observations, the following basic facts and conclusions appear to be inescapable:

1. Nearly 8,000,000 displaced persons were forcibly brought by the Nazi armies into Germany and fell into the hands of the advancing armies of the western Allies. Along with them were some refugees, particularly from the Baltic countries, who fled before the advancing Russians. Since the end of 1945 probably close to 200,000 persons, primarily Jews, fleeing from the eastern countries of Europe, for the most part after the Kielce pogrom, have also been received by our armies. They have been given the same status of displaced persons by our armies as those who were brought forcibly into Germany and Austria during the war by the Nazis.

2. Seven million of the displaced persons so coming into our hands have voluntarily returned to their native countries, for the most part French, Belgians, Dutch, and Russians, with a substantial number of Poles.

3. There remain about 1,000,000 displaced persons in the western zones of Germany and Austria and in Italy who have been taken over by the American, British, and French Armies. There is a wide range of skills and professions found among these people. In the main, they are of sturdy stock, decent life, and of a character to make a contribution to the citizenry of any country. There are some examples to the contrary. There has been an opportunity for some to work in the local economy and remain out of camp. But for the great majority this has not been practicable, with the return of German prisoners of war and the influx of millions of Germans expelled from the eastern areas into a shattered economy.

4. In origin these displaced persons are almost entirely from the Baltic countries now occupied by Russia, from that part of old Poland which is east of the Curzon Line and now held by Russia, from that part of old Poland which lies west of the Curzon Line, and from Yugoslavia. By religion, the largest single element, probably 60 percent, are Catholics, something over 20 percent are

Jews, and the remainder are Protestants and Greek Orthodox. In number, by country of origin, former residents of old Poland predominate. Former residents of the Baltic countries of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia constitute the next largest group; and former residents of Yugoslavia, the next. Most of these persons are in the American zones and are under our ultimate governmental authority. What disposition is to be made of these people? That is, for us, the displaced-persons question.

5. These displaced persons will not willingly return to their eastern areas, with their changed governments and economic systems to which they are opposed or fear. We will never return them forcibly. That would be an unthinkable departure from American traditions.

6. It is not an economically practicable nor a humanly decent solution of the situation for us to turn these victims of the Germans, in the aggregate, back to the Germans against their will.

7. It is not a tolerable solution of the problem for us to continue to maintain these displaced persons in a segregated life in the camps in the western zones of Germany indefinitely at the expense of the American taxpayer. They do not want support; they want an opportunity to earn a living and rebuild their lives.

8. The only solution of the problem which will remove the obstacle to a German peace settlement and the constant source of friction in Germany and with other countries constituted by the continued presence of these displaced persons in Germany, which will remove the present and prospective burden on the American taxpayer and which will give these uprooted victims of the war a chance to rebuild their lives, is the resettlement of from 800,000 to 1,000,000 of these people in countries which may be willing to receive them.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, it was because of the situation that I have outlined that Congress enacted the Displaced Persons Act of 1948. We were a member of the International Refugee Organization and the leading contributor to its expenses. We agreed that resettlement was the only fair and workable solution for these unfortunate people. We felt an obligation to absorb into our own national life a fair share of them, consistent with what our vast economy could reasonably bear.

In spite of the hampering restrictions of that law, we have come a long way toward fulfillment of our goal. I supported that legislation, but I felt it was too narrow in its scope in order to meet the problem of dealing with our responsibilities. That is why I opposed the legislation as it now is, and favor the amendment that is being proposed at the present time.

As of February 17, 1950, a total of 134,563 displaced persons had arrived or were en route to the United States under the act. Under the new totals provided for by the House bill and the Kilgore substitute—which is the bill introduced in place of the amended bill presented by the committee, and of which I think the present occupant of the chair [Mr. O'CONNOR] was one of the sponsors—we would admit about 160,000 more before the end of June 1951, to reach a total of 295,000 IRO displaced persons. In other words, we are almost at midpoint in the total program for IRO displaced persons to which the Kilgore substitute would commit us.

We have heard the question raised, Mr. President, as to whether this total of 295,000 IRO displaced persons is not too much. Let me examine that question for a moment. The total of 295,000 is 95,000 more than our commitment under the present law. But it is reliably estimated that, if the present act is not amended and the whole American program comes to a dead stop on June 30 of this year, there will remain in the care of the IRO on that date at least 250,000 displaced persons, a large proportion of whom might well be in our camps in Germany, where we might have the responsibility of dealing with the problem. Thus the Kilgore substitute, like the House bill, calls upon the United States to face the prospect that these 250,000 refugees will be left stranded in European camps at our taxpayers' expense—and I desire to emphasize that—and to accept less than two-fifths of that remainder, which is all the bills call for, provided, of course, that many can qualify for admission under the terms of the bill.

It has even been stated on this floor, in order to support the contention that we have done more than our fair share for DP's, that the United States has admitted more of these people than all the other countries in the world put together. I cannot possibly understand how any such statement could be arrived at. The total of IRO displaced persons—I repeat, IRO displaced persons—resettled in countries other than the United States, as of the end of 1949, is 598,400. Up to that date the United States, both under the President's Executive order of 1945 and under the present law, had admitted 160,100 or 22 percent of the total.

I realize that figures are boring, but I am merely getting these figures in to show why it is I cannot understand how it can be claimed that we admitted more of these people than all the other countries put together. Actually, according to my figures, it was 22 percent of the total.

The statement that we shall have admitted 549,000 displaced persons by the end of June 1950, is entirely mystifying to me, but I am sure that it does not refer to the displaced persons under jurisdiction of the IRO, who are our primary responsibility. The confusion of the true displaced persons with other groups who do not come under the package we recognize as our IRO responsibility, would seem to me not to meet the responsibility we are undertaking, which is to take care of the problem right in Germany, where we have these camps.

To be sure, it can be fairly said that we have admitted more of these than any other single country, but in view of our fortunate position in the world I am sure Senators will agree that that is as it should be. That might be what is meant that we have admitted more than any other "single" country.

I repeat, Mr. President, we are roughly at the midpoint in our effort to do our share in solving the IRO displaced-persons problem. The job is half done. At this critical moment the committee bill proposes to the Senate a redefinition of the term "displaced person" which would

have the effect of stopping the IRO program in its tracks.

Mr. President, it is a complicated situation, and people become confused when we talk about the IRO program and the over-all so-called displaced-persons program. The IRO is the official displaced-persons program, which grew out of the problem we had in Germany and in the displaced-persons camps, but I cannot agree to any amendments to the program we have accomplished that might confuse what that program is.

I am fully aware that this proposal is offered with the argument that we should do something for another worthy group, the German-speaking expellees or Volksdeutsche. I sympathize entirely with the idea of doing something for that group, and I would like to point out in passing that the Kilgore substitute—representing the point of view of those of us who are opposing the committee bill—expressly calls for the admission of 54,477 of these people, separately from and in addition to the IRO group, and is the only legislation before us which makes any provision for the transportation of expellees to the United States. It seemed wise to those who were working on this legislation in the House to admit this number of this group for very special reasons. In addition it authorizes American representatives to take part in an international conference to find a sound solution to this whole problem. I want to emphasize that. I think the problem needs to be faced, but the problem is a different one from the DP problem, and we only confuse ourselves if we mix them up together.

Mr. President, let me state in more detail why the proposed redefinition of "displaced person" in the committee bill is entirely inappropriate.

First of all, by the statement of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] himself, the ethnic Germans who would be included under his definition number between 8,000,000 and 10,000,000. I repeat, between 8,000,000 and 10,000,000 persons. They represent all the German-speaking communities which resided in non-German Europe before the war. To include this group among those to be considered for eligibility as displaced persons, in a program with an over-all ceiling of approximately 200,000 more admissions, would be a completely inadequate approach to the problem of the ethnic Germans itself. It would raise false hopes among all of this tremendous group—hopes which can never be fulfilled.

Secondly, to handle the processing of this group—by contrast with the IRO organizations in which other nations besides ourselves are helping to solve the DP problem—we would have to set up an entirely new and very expensive American organization in Germany. Since these people are not a concern of the IRO, all the work of registering, housing, feeding, and a thousand other details which the IRO attends to for the people under their care, would fall on the shoulders of the United States alone. And we must bear in mind that the ethnic German group is about seven times as large as the IRO displaced persons group was at its very peak.

Third, the cost of shipping to bring ethnic Germans to the United States must be borne entirely by our own taxpayers. I may say at that point that the IRO is taking care of shipping to the United States of the regular, official IRO displaced persons. The IRO pays for shipping for its own displaced persons, which means that this cost is shared by us with other nations. We will have no such cooperation in resettlement of ethnic Germans.

Fourth, this proposal would disrupt the efforts now in progress to settle these ethnic Germans firmly in Germany among people of their own language and their own culture. It is true that western Germany is greatly overpopulated, but there is reasonable hope that a significant proportion of the ethnic Germans can find a permanent home in Germany. To promise them all an equal chance to come to the United States would be to jeopardize this hope.

Lastly, Mr. President—and this is the crux of this particular phase of the matter—the inclusion of this tremendous group in competition with some 250,000 or 350,000 IRO displaced persons would virtually bring the original displaced persons program to a halt. For every IRO displaced person applying for emigration, applications could be expected from about 30 ethnic Germans. As soon as the flow of processing of ethnic Germans began, it is obvious that the number of IRO displaced persons admitted to this country would be negligible.

To sum up, Mr. President, the committee amendment on the definition of "displaced person" asks us to turn our back on the original obligation we as a nation assumed toward the European displaced persons. It gives very little help to the ethnic Germans for whom it is supposedly drawn. It ignores our moral undertaking as a leading member of the IRO. It defies the concept of international cooperation and makes a mockery of our pledge to support and strengthen the United Nations, of which the IRO is a creature. If it is adopted, it will utterly destroy the remainder of our program for IRO displaced persons.

Mr. President, we have a right to be proud of our action on behalf of displaced persons. It is in line with all our best American traditions. Let us not destroy this great humanitarian program, which has contributed so much to our own human resources and to international peace, by confusing it with a completely unworkable and entirely new obligation toward a group which, however worthy and—I repeat, they are a most worthy group—is so large that its inclusion here would be entirely inappropriate and disastrous.

I simply maintain it is a totally different problem. It must be dealt with, and probably should be dealt with, by the United Nations, with us, but that is not a problem that should be confused with the immediate problem before us.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will reject the committee amendments changing the definition of displaced persons.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN].

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from New Jersey has time remaining during which I may pose to him a question or two.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Jersey has expired. Unless further time is yielded to the Senator from New Jersey he cannot yield to the Senator from Washington for questions.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I will yield five more minutes to the Senator from New Jersey if he desires to use them for the purpose of answering questions.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am glad to have that additional time allotted to me for that purpose.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, what was the request of the Senator from Washington?

Mr. CAIN. My purpose is to pose several questions to the Senator from New Jersey directed to the very fine presentation he has just made.

Mr. KILGORE. Very well; I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey that he has, to my mind, given the best explanation and the best definition of the character of the task which the United States undertook to assume several years ago when we first approved and passed the Displaced Persons Act.

The Senator from New Jersey has pointed out that as a direct result of enemy action between the years particularly of 1941 and 1945 there were millions of human beings who were ruthlessly moved from one part of Europe to another, and in fact at the end of the war approximately eight to nine million such persons were situated somewhere in the area of our American responsibility in Italy, Austria, and Germany. The Senator went on to add that all but something less than 1,000,000 of those persons were repatriated to their own homeland, without too much trouble. The residue, or roughly about 1,000,000 such persons we and other free nations have been attempting to provide with a haven. The Senator from New Jersey has told us that our fundamental purpose is to provide for this residue which was so badly disrupted and hurt by enemy action.

I was exceedingly impressed by the way in which the Senator from New Jersey has carefully explained what our American undertaking and responsibility and assignment and obligation was. But it is, sir, against the Senator's explanation that I find it difficult to reconcile one item. Would the Senator explain why, against his definition of what America sought to do, we find it necessary to recommend presently a cut-off date of January 1, 1949? I ask that question for several reasons, one of which is, I have been given to understand that admission to our American displaced-persons camps was cut off some time in early April of 1947, and that displaced persons were not to be registered after that same date in 1947. Therefore, logic indicates to me that if the Senate accepts the proposed cut-off date of January 1, 1949, we shall be providing assistance for some persons who probably were not even in

Germany or Austria or Italy in 1947. The Senator would help my thinking materially in trying to reconcile our objective with our present recommendation that we permit people to characterize themselves as being displaced persons more than 4 years after the last shot was fired in anger on the continent of Europe.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I appreciate the distinguished Senator's question, and it is very relevant, because to be entirely consistent we should take the April 1947 date as the wind up of the package, the tying up of the package for which we are responsible. The distinguished Senator will remember that in the special session of Congress in the summer, I think, of 1947 or 1948, whatever it was the President called us back, I tried to get the date changed from 1945 to 1947 on the very basis of the argument now made.

Mr. CAIN. I recall that very vividly, and I recall likewise that no Member of the Senate at that time recommended a cut-off date later than April of 1947.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is correct.

Mr. CAIN. Yet now each of the several bills before us includes a date a year and 8 months beyond the one the Senator from New Jersey and many other fine Senators were attempting to fix two short years ago.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Well, we are dealing with a bill that comes to us from the House, and the House bill, and also the bill reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, make the date 1949. I am advised that not to exceed 35,000 so-called DP's, or people without homes, are included within that period between 1947 and 1949, if we stick to this package idea. The Senator from Washington understands what I mean by the package idea.

Mr. CAIN. Is that to say that we are going to include 35,000 whom we do not characterize actually as being displaced persons?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. If I had been asked to draft this legislation, I will be perfectly honest with the Senator and say I would have stuck to the April 1947 date, because there would then be no controversy over the point we are trying to make.

Mr. CAIN. None whatever.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. But there has been a feeling that people who have had practically the same environment and experience between these dates, and they have been carefully screened, amount to about 35,000. There is no difference between the House bill and the committee bill respecting them. I thought that possibly in trying to change the bill for pure consistency we might be making a mistake. But personally I think the sound position would be the one the Senator from Washington is making, and we ought to have made our package tied up as of April 1947.

So I have no quarrel with him, if he wishes to submit an amendment to make the date April 21, 1947, so as to make it perfectly consistent. If the Senator offers such an amendment, it will be very difficult for me not to support it. I think

that is where all of us have our responsibility.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from New Jersey that I have submitted an amendment, which is to be printed and lie on the table, providing that April 21, 1947, shall be the cut-off date. I submit that amendment for very logical reasons, partly because when we debated this matter in the special session to which the Senator from New Jersey has addressed himself no Member of the Senate had any cut-off date later than April 21, 1947, to suggest.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded the Senator from New Jersey has expired.

The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN].

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, as used to be said in the Navy, and still is, "Hear this." If it were possible, I should like to have the words, "Hear this" printed in capital letters in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. President, the Supreme Court of the United States has recently ruled that an alien is entitled to American citizenship, even though that alien has stated that he could not or would not contribute anything to be used solely and directly in furtherance of armed conflict. This decision means but one thing, namely, that any alien or immigrant or displaced person—for they are one and the same thing after they have come to this country—can determine whether he or she wishes to fight for the United States in the event of an armed conflict or of war. The Supreme Court case in which the decision was rendered is *Cohnstaedt v. Immigration and Naturalization Service* (No. 373, October term, 1949), decided February 20, 1950. The Court based its decision on the earlier case of *Girouard v. United States* (328 U. S. 61), decided April 22, 1946.

I want to believe, Mr. President, that the Senate will promptly agree to so amend the naturalization oath, which must be taken by every alien before he is admitted to American citizenship, that it will require every alien who seeks our citizenship to pledge him or herself to bear arms on behalf of the United States when required by law.

Mr. President, earlier today I submitted an amendment to the pending displaced-persons bill, to be printed and lie on the table. The amendment amends the naturalization oath simply by adding a single sentence. The amendment reads: "That I will bear arms on behalf of the United States when required by law."

This amendment, Mr. President, needs no further word of explanation. Everyone in the world can understand its meaning and the obvious reasons why it has been submitted. I think a vast majority of all American citizens will urge the adoption of the amendment.

Every alien who seeks American citizenship certainly does so because of his

or her desire to flee from tyranny, oppression, and suffering. Such aliens want to come to this country because it is free and safe and secure. These aliens know that American citizenship will provide them with an opportunity which does not presently exist anywhere else on the face of the earth. It must be, Mr. President, that every such alien will be determined, once he or she has become an American citizen, to fight with those of us who are native-born Americans to preserve freedom and opportunity and security. Should there be aliens who seek to take advantage of everything we in this country so freely offer to them, without being willing to fight for America should that need arise, those persons, few in number though they may be, should be denied admission to the United States.

I have no desire, Mr. President, to criticize the Supreme Court of the United States; but the Court has rendered a decision which many an American will feel is adverse to the future welfare and security of America. Because of the Supreme Court's decision, an alien who becomes an American citizen is entitled to say what he will or will not do in time of trouble, strife, or bloodshed. To my mind, at least, no alien who is worthy of being protected and helped by the United States could possibly resist or resent the amendment I have offered. The only kind of aliens whom we welcome as naturalized American citizens are those who will express their appreciation and their gratefulness to America by being willing to fight and die when and where required for America in the event of an armed conflict.

Mr. President, I think the adoption of the amendment will say to all aliens everywhere, that America is willing to help those in trouble overseas who are just as willing to help America; and its adoption will say plainly to the American people that the Congress has no intention of being foolhardy or careless in its admitted desire to provide shelter and protection to those who presently suffer in lands across the seas.

Mr. President, I was not personally aware of the recent action taken on this question by the Supreme Court. That action was called to my attention by a typical American citizen who happens to be a constituent of mine in the city of Tacoma, Wash., whose name I had previously not heard of, and whom I have personally never met. By way of appreciation for his drawing to my attention a step which I think should be taken, I ask unanimous consent that his letter in its entirety may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, where it can be read and understood by Americans generally.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TACOMA, WASH., February 21, 1950.

Senator HARRY P. CAIN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I see by the morning paper that the Supreme Court of the United States has ruled that an alien is entitled to citizenship even though the alien has stated that he could not "contribute anything to be used

solely and directly in furtherance of armed conflict." The naturalization law requires that an alien, before he can become a citizen, must, under oath, before the naturalization court, swear that he will "support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States of America against all enemies, foreign and domestic * * *." (8 USCA 735.) It appears the Supreme Court has construed the words "support and defend" to mean something entirely different than the definitions of the words themselves suggest. I could go along with the Supreme Court when they ruled a noncombatant could become a citizen for he was at least supporting the defensive forces, but this present ruling is an insult to my discharge button, and the service it represents.

I suggest that a resolution defining the terms "support and defend" as being a willingness to aid this country in time of war or national emergency, be introduced in Congress and its passage urged. It appears that the only way to prevent further prostitution of the oath of allegiance to the United States by the Supreme Court, is for Congress to tell the Court, and the people just what those words mean.

Yours very truly,

GEORGE S. DAILEY.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, when the letter was received from my constituent, drawing my attention to what he thought was not a good thing recently done by the Supreme Court, I sent his letter to Mr. Peyton Ford, the assistant to the Attorney General of the United States. Mr. Ford has stated, in response, as the opinion of the Attorney General, and for himself, that the Attorney General's office made arguments against the recent action taken by the Supreme Court, and that the office of the Attorney General thinks it would be in the future best interests of the United States to so amend the prevailing naturalization oath that any alien who comes to us for the many kinds of assistance and protection we can give will say in his oath of allegiance, in effect, "If the time comes when the country to which I come, seeking protection, has need of me to fight to continue that protection and security and care, I, as a former alien, out of my gratefulness for my citizenship, will be among the first to be willing to fight, if the law so requires."

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield for a question, let me inquire whether the Senator thinks that instead of offering that amendment to the displaced-persons law, it should be offered to the oath of allegiance required to be taken by all immigrants, rather than be restricted to a certain group of immigrants.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I could not possibly agree more sincerely or more completely with the observation just made by the Senator from West Virginia. If my amendment is agreed to it will change the naturalization oath which is provided for by the Nationality Act of 1940, and this oath is taken by all immigrants.

Mr. President, in order that the Record may be as clear and as concrete as possible, I ask unanimous consent that the letter under date of March 16, 1950, received by me from Mr. Peyton Ford, the assistant to the Attorney General, may be printed in the Record at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT TO
THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, March 16, 1950.

Hon. HARRY P. CAIN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CAIN: Your letter of March 4, with enclosed letter of February 21 to you from Mr. George S. Dailey, of Tacoma, Wash., to Attorney General McGrath has been referred to me for reply.

Mr. Dailey is correct in his understanding of the ruling by the Supreme Court in the naturalization case in which it was decided that an alien, who stated he would not contribute anything to be used solely and directly in furtherance of armed conflict, is not debarred on that account from naturalization as a citizen. The case to which he refers is *Cohnstaedt v. Immigration and Naturalization Service*, No. 373, October term, 1949, decided February 20, 1950. The Court based its decision on the earlier case of *Girouard v. United States* (328 U. S. 61), decided April 22, 1946.

Inasmuch as both of these decisions result from the Court's interpretation of the Nationality Act of 1940, and particularly section 335 of that act, 8 U. S. C. 735, Congress could, by appropriate legislation, amend the act so as to impose prerequisites for citizenship not included within the language of existing law, as construed by the Supreme Court. The Department of Justice took the opposite view in both of these cases, and argued that the present provisions of the Nationality Act of 1940 should be construed as barring from citizenship those who decline, on account of religious reasons, to give aid to the Military Establishment, but our views were rejected. The matter is now one for congressional consideration and decision.

I am returning Mr. Dailey's letter herewith.

Sincerely yours,

PEYTON FORD,
The Assistant to the Attorney General.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, finally, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the text of the amendment which I have submitted to the displaced-persons bill; and in that connection, I point out that the words "bear arms on behalf of the United States when required by law," as those words appear twice in the amendment constitute the only change which the amendment would make in the present naturalization oath.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

On page 19, after line 14, insert a new section, as follows:

"Sec. 14. Subsections (a) and (b) of section 335 of the Nationality Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 1157; U. S. C., title 8, sec. 735 (a) and (b)) are amended to read as follows:

"(a) A person who has petitioned for naturalization shall, before being admitted to citizenship, take an oath in open court (1) to support the Constitution of the United States; (2) to renounce and abjure absolutely and entirely all allegiance and fidelity to any foreign prince, potentate, state, or sovereignty of whom or which the petitioner was before a subject or citizen; (3) to support and defend the Constitution and the laws of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; (4) to bear true faith and allegiance to the same; and (5) to bear arms on behalf of the United States when

required by law: *Provided*, That in the case of the naturalization of a child under the provisions of section 315 or 316 the naturalization court may waive the taking of such oath if in the opinion of the court the child is too young to understand its meaning.

"(b) The oath prescribed by subsection (a) of this section which the petitioner for naturalization is required to take shall be in the following form:

"I hereby declare, on oath, that I absolutely and entirely renounce and abjure all allegiance and fidelity to any foreign prince, potentate, state, or sovereignty of whom or which I have heretofore been a subject or citizen; that I will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States of America against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I will bear arms on behalf of the United States when required by law; and that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion: So help me God. In acknowledgment whereof I have hereunto affixed my signature."

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I yield 20 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I am one of the sponsors of the so-called Kilgore substitute. I want today to speak briefly to the subject of the basic definition of a displaced person, and the differences between the definition in the committee amendment and the definition in the Kilgore substitute, and how they compare with the present law.

When the present law was under discussion, and finally was passed, its purpose we generally felt to be the United States attempt to do its fair share toward offering a home to men, women, and children who were under the International Refugee Organization. This Organization had previously been approved unanimously by the Senate. It was clear that it could not go on indefinitely without a tremendous drain on the pocketbooks of the American taxpayers, and that it could not go on without hurting human beings who had no place to call home and who were truly refugees from persecution. The definition which was adopted, and which is at present in the law, is the exact one that is contained in Annex L of the IRO constitution. When this definition was passed in the Senate, the principal argument concerned the date on which the displaced persons had to be in the camps in order to be included as displaced persons. The date in the bill as finally passed was set as December 22, 1945. At that time I favored a later date in 1947, but the amendment which I and other Senators sponsored was turned down. Both the committee amendment and the Kilgore substitute now change the date to January 1, 1949, but the Kilgore substitute continues the language of the present law whereas the committee amendment deletes the provision in the present law that a displaced person means one so defined in the IRO, and substitutes a new definition which includes not only the displaced persons for which the IRO has been given responsibility, but also some 8,000,000 expellees who are not the concern of any international body. This definition clearly dilutes the availability of the authorized number of visas to the displaced persons

who come under the IRO definition. It changes almost completely the original intent of the Congress as regards the whole displaced-persons organization.

To sum up briefly, the Kilgore substitute continues the present definition of a DP, merely changing the date. The committee amendment also changes the date but completely redefines a DP by including 8,000,000 expellees or refugees of German ethnic origin.

This latter group is now the subject of a special provision in section 12 of the DP Act. Furthermore, several specific amendments are pending to enlarge the benefits of the law as they relate to this specific group. The proposal contained in the Kilgore substitute will enlarge and, in my judgment, improve the degree and manner of treatment of this group to the extent that it will make possible the immigration of about 54,000 people under conditions and arrangements as closely comparable to those available to DP's as it has been possible to devise. The proposed committee definition on the other hand will make special provisions for 8,000,000 of these people and in addition include them in the general scope of the act.

In substance, Mr. President, the issue is simply this: Shall we continue the present definition of a DP in order to make it possible to terminate the International Refugee Organization by March 31, 1951, as we have definitely stated to other nations in that Organization we intend to do, or shall we, by redefining a DP, include in that definition some 8,000,000 more people and thus make it impossible to end the IRO by March 31 next year? If the IRO ends and the DP's have not been settled, in the American zones they will become dependent upon us as taxpayers and we will not have accomplished what we are trying to do. Originally we set out to take care of these DP's as soon as we possibly could. We have several times changed the date as to who should be included in the group. The Kilgore substitute further extends that date, but it does not redefine who is a DP beyond that change in time.

I have great sympathy for the German ethnic group. I believe that they may well deserve consideration in a separate bill and receive in this way special treatment, but I am opposed to adopting the committee amendment which in substance will make it impossible for us to carry through our original intention. We would thus be fooling the German ethnics into believing that many more of them may come into the country than the provisions of the committee amendment really permit. For instance, the committee bill will authorize the admission of 330,000 persons. Of this number, 290,000 visas are available jointly for IRO DP's and expellees, 40,000 for other persons, plus 54,744 for expellees. Thus while the present law authorizes 203,000 visas for IRO DP's alone and the House bill approves 302,000, the committee bill, in fact, cuts back the number of IRO DP's below even the present law. Thus cut-back comes by diluting the total number of visas available to IRO DP's by including expellees in the total number.

The Kilgore substitute specifically admits the 54,744 German ethnics and gives them the same travel allowance as DP's. On the other hand, the committee amendment admits the 54,744 expellees and at the same time dilutes the DP's with the balance of approximately 8,000,000 German ethnics but gives no travel allowance to the 54,744.

The solution of the DP problem is one to which the United States is very positively committed. We are members of the IRO. The contribution by our Treasury to the IRO is most substantial. In fact, of the amount that is actually spent, the contribution is over 50 percent and has amounted in total to well over \$200,000,000. There is pending before Congress an item of over \$25,000,000 to complete the life of IRO by next March. The Senate Committee on Appropriations has a letter from the State Department in which that Department definitely commits itself to end our membership in the IRO next March. It is perfectly clear if the committee amendment is adopted this cannot be done. If the IRO stops then, it is clear to me that we will assume the full burden of the DP's who are left in our zone. In passing the present DP law, Congress reaffirmed the policy of the United States by limiting the applicability of its provisions to the DP's who are the concern of the IRO. The definition contained in the present law used the language of the IRO constitution in order to solve the problem for which the IRO was created. If this new definition is now adopted that will be defeated. The program upon which the Government has been working for several years with resulting outlays of money and effort will not be accomplished if the expellee group is now included in the general class to be known as eligible DP's. I repeat, the expellee problem can very well be the subject of separate consideration and sympathetic appeal.

Furthermore, the present pipe line admitting DP's will obviously have to be slowed down if this committee amendment becomes law, in order to get the proper assurances for expellees and in order to get them processed under the law. Surely a suggestion of such sympathetic appeal and of such magnitude can properly be treated as a distinct problem in order that Congress may make whatever provision it deems necessary and do so without backing away from its accepted responsibility as a member of the IRO. We cannot afford to confuse these two separate problems and thus permit one to defeat or impair the other.

The Kilgore amendment provides, in addition, for calling an international conference to deal with this important problem on a broader basis. Such a suggestion may provide a solution that will be much more effective for the expellees and less costly for our taxpayers. Outside of the interference of this amendment with our foreign policy and the international undertaking that we are trying to carry out, there are practical considerations that it seems to me must be taken into consideration if the committee amendment is adopted. The DP's

who are and have been the concern of the IRO have undergone registration and other identifying processes. Some of these have now been pending for several years. There has been much criticism on the floor of the Senate that some ineligible persons have been able to get visas because of the lack of information or because of false information as to date of entry, background, and other similar considerations.

If the present definition is adopted it will make eligible some 8,000,000 people who have not been the subject of international care and control, who have not been registered and recorded by military and international agents and about whose background we have little or no information. In many instances their presence in the pertinent areas is of such duration that their general behavior and record are not those upon which our agents can predicate judgment with the same certainty that they have been able to exercise by watching people who have been under international supervision for a number of years. If there is criticism of our present admission of DP's and their ability to get into this country, certainly the increase of some 8,000,000 new persons will increase those problems many thousandfold. That does not require any imagination on our part to conceive. If we are to deal with this large mass of people about whom so little is known and seek to bring them within the committee definition of eligible DP's with its dateline and other requirements, we shall have to rely more than ever upon their own statements as to who they are, where they came from, and why, and at what time. To make it necessary for the processing officers to throw cases of that kind into the same category with the DP's is bound to bring about confusion, a general slowing down in the whole process and run into adverse critical appraisal of the operation.

The Kilgore substitute bill puts sufficiently few new people into the DP category to make it entirely possible to process them easily and quickly.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point for just one question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Is it not a fact that under the present act, in which the IRO definition is used, which is carried into the substitute, we are dealing with a registered group as opposed to an unregistered group of the 8,000,000 who might be taken in, if the definition were changed?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator is absolutely correct. That is the point I wish to make as clearly as I can, because the entire criticism, as I see it, by Senators on the Senate floor, has been that there is a lack of information about those coming in, and if we should do what is undertaken to be provided in the McCarran bill, or the committee bill, those hazards will be increased.

Mr. KILGORE. Is it not a further fact that in dealing with the registered persons, we are to a great extent dealing with people whose records we can get, whereas, if we get into the question of the so-called *Deutschesvolk*, we shall be

dealing with a people all of whose records are behind the iron curtain, and utterly inaccessible?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct, so far as I know.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one question on this particular point?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. It seems to me to be a fact that if the Senate adopts the cut-off date of January 1, 1949, which is included in either the committee bill or the substitute, it will provide for taking care of displaced persons who, as of this time, have not been registered as such by anyone. That seems to me to be so because I have been told that the registration files as to entries into American displaced-persons camps were closed as of some date in April 1947.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would answer the Senator from Washington in the same way in which the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] answered him. I, personally, 2 years ago, approved the April 1947 date. I spoke for it, but it was defeated. The committee and the Kilgore substitute bring out a new date. I believe January 1, 1949, is a fairer date, and I am willing to accept it. I did approve the other date, and I think there is something in what the Senator has said.

Mr. CAIN. I raise the point sincerely, for two reasons: First, it seems to me that the 1947 date is both realistic and fair. Second, I have been trying, without very much success, to get an answer which satisfies me as to why that date should not be included, when many other persons have come into the area of our influence.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I think the organization for examination and inspection of those displaced persons is much better than it was, and, undoubtedly, less harm will be done by letting them in. It will be more humane and a little more fair.

Mr. CAIN. We all seek to see that no harm is done to this Nation, and that fairness is provided for those persons across the seas.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to make one other point. If the committee definition becomes law, we will then put the so-called expellees into two categories. We will put them into the category that they are now in under section 12 of the law, which will permit approximately 54,000 to be admitted, and we will define them as DP's. These expellees can then apply directly to the Displaced Persons Commission under one section and directly to the American consul under the other. They can then sit back and await the results of whichever will process them more rapidly or advantageously. The resulting confusion between the American consul's office and the Displaced Persons Commission will be constant. Will the consul make the preliminary investigation? Will the Displaced Persons Commission do it? Will the mere circumstance of which section a particular person would apply under determine the kind of procedure to be adopted in his case? Fur-

thermore, the same person may apply under one section in one area and under another section in another area with further confusion possible.

The debate on the floor of the Senate confirms me in the belief that the great majority of the Senate want to clear up this confusion on admission. We want in this body to make certain that we get the best possible people as future citizens. We want to make it possible to give them the closest scrutiny that we can before we admit them to become citizens in these troublesome days. This particular provision probably more than any other will add to the administrative difficulties and make the law more unmanageable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I yield five more minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. President, I have joined with others of my colleagues in the Kilgore substitute because I believe that it is a fair, practical method of admission and will help to end one of the most distressing human problems that has arisen out of World War II. In 1948 I joined in some amendments on this subject which were defeated. I believed then that there should be some further changes made that were not finally adopted. In 1949 I filed with other Senators certain amendments. If we keep to our course, we have hopes that this problem may be ended a year from now. If we further complicate this problem by adding 8,000,000 more people it becomes a problem which will not permit us to complete our first objective and merely confuses it with another good objective which may be the subject of proper consideration by our country in the days to come. To the extent the separate although kindred problems are to be met by Congress we should meet them, but, unmistakably, we should not confuse them to the detriment of each other. We should further remove rather than increase the administrative burdens and complexities which have already been created.

I urge that committee amendment No. 3, contained in the language of the committee bill on pages 3 and 4 and the first half of page 5, be defeated, and that that part of the Kilgore substitute which is applicable be adopted. Put it another way round. I want to see the Kilgore substitute adopted. I have been addressing my remarks specifically to that portion of the committee amendment on pages 3, 4, and 5 which I believe should in any circumstances be defeated, even though the Kilgore substitute might not be passed.

I also hope that whatever action Congress wishes to take with respect to the expellees may be done by a separate provision, in the manner and to the extent contemplated by section 9 of the substitute bill. This action will materially liberalize and improve section 12 of the present law relating to expellees of German ethnic origin. If, in the opinion of the Congress, this is not sufficient for

these expellees, then a separate law, after careful consideration, should be passed. I also refer the Senate, Mr. President, most respectfully, to section 12 of the Kilgore substitute, which provides a method by which an international conference can be held on this subject.

Mr. President, as there has been much debate and difference of opinion on the question of inspection and methods of screening of DP's, I should like to insert at the conclusion of my remarks a memorandum that I requested of the Displaced Persons Commission on this problem. I insert it because it gives briefly, and I think clearly, what the Displaced Persons Commission, the Immigration Office, and the American consul are now doing. Perhaps in every instance these steps may not be covered as thoroughly as they should be covered, but at least it gives us an idea in a few words, and in one place, what our authorities in Europe and in the United States are trying to accomplish.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a memorandum on the screening of displaced persons, which was given to me by the Displaced Persons Commission, at my request. It specifically takes up in order the 11 steps which a displaced person must go through before he can be admitted into this country. It gives in detail the number of American officials a displaced person must see personally, the amount of paper work he must do, and additional American officials he can see if there is any doubt as to his being admitted.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM ON SCREENING OF DISPLACED PERSONS

The so-called screening procedure with respect to displaced persons is as follows:

First step: An American decides to sponsor a displaced person's entry into the United States. In 75 percent of all the cases received thus far, the American sponsor specifies a particular displaced person by name, thereby himself selecting the displaced person he wants. In the vast majority of the rest of the cases, the American sponsor either specifically designates an American voluntary church organization or his own State Displaced Persons Commission to name the displaced person for him. In the remainder of the cases, the displaced persons are named by American selection of the Displaced Persons Commission.

Second step: The name so chosen is given to the Displaced Persons Commission, either in the United States or Europe, for processing.

Third step: The Displaced Persons Commission requests the International Refugee Organization to provide whatever information it may have on these individuals who have already been named, and particularly for a certification as to this status under IRO constitution and for a certification of what its records indicate as to the person's movements. Since its beginning in July 1947, the IRO has been under the direction of an American. The IRO constitution was ratified by the Senate on March 25, 1947, by a unanimous voice of the Senate. It is important to remember that the IRO is so anathema to the Soviet Union that the Soviets are not members of the IRO and in fact constantly attack the IRO.

Fourth step: After the IRO submits its information to the Displaced Persons Commission, an American selector reviews the evidence. The evidence from IRO is purely prima facie, and the Displaced Persons Commission can and does go behind it. If there be any doubts still unresolved, the American selector interviews the displaced persons in question. All of this is directed to a preliminary determination of eligibility. This is purely preliminary, to determine whether the person is disqualified at that step, or whether the case is to be sent to the Counter Intelligence Corps for investigation. A determination of preliminary eligibility is merely a determination that the case is prima facie worthy of investigation and further processing. At this step, 29 percent of all cases are disqualified by the Commission, even before investigation by the Counter Intelligence Corps.

Fifth step: The Counter Intelligence Corps of the United States Army investigates each displaced person. This involves a thorough personal interview of each displaced person by a trained American intelligence agent, plus a neighborhood check by a trained American intelligence agent. This is done in each case. At the same time the case is checked against the central files and records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The Counter Intelligence Corps then submits to the Displaced Persons Commission a report of its findings on security, criminality, and eligibility.

The Counter Intelligence Corps findings on security, if derogatory to the displaced person, are accepted as conclusive by the Displaced Persons Commission. Where the Counter Intelligence Corps finds eligibility data in conflict with information supplied by the IRO, the Displaced Persons Commission accepts the Counter Intelligence Corps findings. Here, as in the preceding one, the IRO's information is not conclusive upon the Displaced Persons Commission.

The attached letter of February 21, 1950, from the deputy director of the Intelligence Division of the Headquarters of the European Command of the United States Army, says, in part:

1. "It is felt that the CIC investigation is as thorough as possible under existing conditions."

2. "CIC never closes a case on an individual as long as unexplored leads exist."

3. "CIC has never accepted IRO documentation of an individual, forwarded to them for investigation by the Displaced Persons Commission, as being a true portrayal of facts."

Sixth step: An American case analyst, on the Commission's staff, then reviews the whole file, including the report of the CIC's interview. If he determines that another interview is necessary, he conducts one. If the file shows no need for a further investigation, the American case analyst prepares and signs a report as to whether the person is an eligible displaced person. If he so determines, the case along with the entire file is submitted to the consul without recommendation. If not, he stops the case.

Seventh step: The displaced person is then given a thorough medical examination by the United States Public Health Service, before the case reaches the vice consul for interview. Any medical evidence that would disqualify is immediately reported and would close the case.

Eighth step: Only after all these previous steps does the case come before the consul, who interviews each displaced person. If the consul finds favorably under the law, he issues and signs a visa. He can and does deny visas on the regular exclusion grounds of the immigration laws and upon fraudulently established eligibility under the Displaced Persons Act.

Ninth step: Each displaced person is interviewed by an immigrant inspector in Eu-

rope, who endorses the visa if the displaced person is admissible under the law, otherwise he excludes such immigrant. If the inspector finds that eligibility has been established by fraud, he can exclude the displaced person under the law.

Tenth step: Upon arrival in the United States, each displaced person is again examined by the United States Public Health Service. Again any adverse medical evidence disqualifies the person and subjects him to exclusion.

Eleventh step: The displaced person is again examined by another immigrant inspector, who has complete authority to exclude the displaced person under the law, including medical grounds certified by the United States Public Health Service. Even though a displaced person is cleared in Europe, new information affecting his admissibility is sent ahead by cable resulting in his possible exclusion on arrival. At this step also, a displaced person may be excluded by the immigrant inspector if the displaced person's eligibility was established by fraud. Even after admission to the United States, if excludability is shown, he can be deported at any time within 5 years of his entry. On some grounds, such as subversive activity, he can be deported without regard to date of entry.

Thus, before leaving Europe, the displaced persons are regularly interviewed by at least four American officials. At least two of these interviews, those by the Counter Intelligence Corps of the United States Army and by the United States Public Health Service, take place before the displaced person reaches the consul. In addition, where necessary, there are two further interviews before the case reaches the consul, one by the Commission's selector and the other by the Commission's case analyst, each of whom is an American official.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I yield 25 minutes to the junior Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I intend to speak plainly. I think I owe it to my colleagues, my constituents, and my country to describe, in the simple language of fact, why I oppose with all my strength the amendments to the Displaced Persons Act reported out by the eminent chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. McCARRAN. I shall try to explain how these amendments, far from liberalizing or strengthening the displaced-persons program, actually pervert and destroy it.

The problem of the displaced persons has been with us in a legislative sense, for 5 years. For five long years we have been wrestling with this problem, studying it, investigating it, debating it, and appropriating money for its solution. But for most of the displaced persons, the problem is a much older one. Some of them have known it for 10 and 15 years. For 15 years, Mr. President, some of these Europeans have been uprooted, persecuted, tortured, and oppressed. Children have been born and have grown up in this half world of hopelessness, fear, and hate.

Mr. President, we are not dealing in this legislation with potatoes, natural gas, oleomargarine, or rivers and harbors. We are dealing with human souls. We cannot weigh this legislation as if the displaced persons were surplus cotton or grain which can be indefinitely stored in bins or warehouses. Human beings are perishable. Human beings cannot be dumped into the ocean or destroyed because they are surplus.

We are deciding the fate of people, people who are living in camps, in huts, barracks, and shelters, in lands which are completely alien to them. We are dealing with people who have no homeland, who have no country to which they can return, or in which they can stay. We are dealing with people who have no racial or national affinity with the lands in which they are quartered, and who are tolerated in those lands only because these people are under the protecting care of the United States and the other Western Powers. We are dealing with people who are tragic casualties of the cataclysm which has shaken the entire world to its very foundations.

But we did not and are not enacting this legislation merely because these people are poor, or hungry, or without shelter, or unemployed, although most of them are in that condition. It is not because of these factors that we are asked to liberalize our displaced-persons law. Rather it is because we have an established obligation to these particular displaced persons. We accepted and subscribed to this obligation in good faith 5 years ago. It is an obligation we must honor today.

Mr. President, we are all concerned today with the mounting cost of government, and with the heavy tax burden under which we labor. Yet we have been and are continuing to help support these individuals in the displaced-persons camps, in the various bivouacs and quarters where they are now located, through our contributions to the International Refugee Organization.

The United States has been contributing about 60 percent of the budget of this organization. Between July 1, 1947, and June 30, 1950, the IRO will have spent over \$300,500,000 in carrying out its mission. For the fiscal year 1949-50 the budget of the IRO was \$122,863,000, of which the United States contributed \$70,447,000. We will be required to contribute a comparable amount during all the time the IRO continues in operation, which means during all the time the displaced-persons problem remains unsolved.

Unless we take the necessary steps to help solve this problem through the admission into our country of a proper number of these people—these people who are now the concern of the IRO—we will be forced to keep on making these heavy appropriations and expenditures. These people whose productive energies could be an economic asset to our country will continue to constitute, instead, an oppressive liability.

Mr. President, of course our first and dominating concern must be the security and welfare of our own country. But it ill befits the supporters of the McCarran amendments to imply that those of us who do not share their extravagant alarm at the displaced-persons program are unmindful of the security of this Nation. Can it be thought for a moment that the 18 sponsors of the substitute bill, including Members from both sides of this House without party distinction, are less zealous and less anxious about national security than the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada or the senior Senator from Mississippi?

Can it be assumed that Gen. Lucius Clay, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Mr. Philip Murray, and Mr. William Green are any less patriotic or less concerned about our national security?

I have here the names of the Governors of the 23 States of the Union who have endorsed either the substitute bill or the House bill, which, of course, is similar in all major respects to the substitute measure. I should like especially to read a statement made on March 3, 1950, by the Governor of my own State, Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, in regard to this bill:

The bill introduced by Senators KILGORE and FERGUSON is a desirable bill. It eliminates the unfair 40-percent priority for persons from annexed territories. It eliminates the discriminatory 30-percent preference to agriculturalists. It bars discrimination against any applicant because of race, religion, or national origin. I should like to restate emphatically my strong view that the Kilgore-Ferguson bill should become law.

Would the supporters of the McCarran bill say that Governor Dewey is unconcerned with the security of the United States against subversion and infiltration? Could it be said that any of the 23 Governors who are supporting this measure are so unconcerned?

Mr. President, I ask the consent of the Senate to print the names of these 23 Governors and their States at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the names were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Alabama: James Folsom.
Arkansas: Sidney McMath.
Colorado: William Lee Knous.
Illinois: A. E. Stevenson.
Indiana: Henry Schrieker.
Kansas: Frank Carlson.
Kentucky: Earl Clements.
Louisiana: Earl K. Long.
Maryland: William Preston Lane, Jr.
Michigan: Gene Mennen Williams.
Minnesota: Luther W. Youngdahl.
Montana: John W. Bonner.
New Jersey: Alfred E. Driscoll.
New York: Thomas E. Dewey.
North Carolina: William Kerr Scott.
Ohio: Frank J. Lausche.
Oklahoma: Roy J. Turner.
Oregon: Douglas McKay.
Pennsylvania: James H. Duff.
Rhode Island: John O. Pastore.
Vermont: Ernest W. Gibson.
Washington: Arthur B. Langlie.
West Virginia: Okey L. Patteson.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have seen the statements of the National Grange and of the American Farm Bureau Federation and of the United States Chamber of Commerce, of 21 religious organizations, of 14 women's organizations, of 17 labor organizations, of three veterans' organizations, of 22 social, civic, welfare, and other organizations.

All these organizations are supporting the principles of the minority substitute as against the principles of the committee bill. I ask unanimous consent to print the names of these organizations at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATIONS

American Friends Service Committee.
American Unitarian Association.

Congregational Christian Churches; Council for Social Action.

Disciples of Christ; International Convention.

Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America.

Friends Committee on National Legislation.

Home Missions Council of North America.

Knights of Columbus.

Mennonite Central Committee.

National Catholic Rural Life Conference.

National Catholic Welfare Conference.

National Lutheran Council.

Northern Baptist Convention.

Presbyterian Church, U. S. A.

Presbyterian Church in the United States.

Protestant Episcopal Church: General Convention.

Southern Baptist Convention.

Synagogue Council of America.

Unitarian Service Committee.

World Alliance for International Friendship through Churches.

YMCA—International Board.

WOMEN'S ORGANIZATIONS

American Association of University Women.

Catholic Daughters of America.

Hadassah.

League of Women Voters.

National Council of Catholic Women.

National Council of Jewish Women.

National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs.

National Federation of Congregational Christian Women.

United Council of Church Women.

Women's American Art.

Women's Auxiliary of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

Women's Division of the Methodist Church.

Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (United States section).

YWCA—National Board.

LABOR ORGANIZATIONS

American Federation of Labor.

Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, CIO.

Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, AFL.

Hotel and Restaurant Employees International Alliance and Bartenders International League of America, AFL.

Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, CIO.

International Ladies' Garment Workers Union, AFL.

International Longshoremen Association, AFL.

International Printing Pressmen and Assistants Union of North America, AFL.

Jewish Labor Committee.

National Maritime Union of America, CIO.

National Women's Trade Union League.

Oil Workers International Union, CIO.

United Automobile, Aircraft-Agricultural Implement Workers of America, CIO.

United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, AFL.

United Cement, Lime, and Gypsum Workers International Union, AFL.

United Hatters, Caps, and Millinery Workers International Union, AFL.

VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

American Veterans Committee.

Catholic War Veterans.

Jewish War Veterans.

SOCIAL, CIVIC, WELFARE, AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

American Association of Social Workers.

American Association for the United Nations.

American Civil Liberties Union.

American Council for Judaism.

American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service: Committee on Displaced Persons.

American Farm Bureau Federation.

Americans for Democratic Action.

American Federation of International Institutes.

American Jewish Committee.

B'nai B'rith.

Common Council for American Unity.

Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds.

Hebrew Sheltering and Immigrant Aid Society.

International Social Service.

International Refugee and Relief Committee.

National Community Relations Advisory Council.

National Congress of Parents and Teachers: Board of Managers.

National Federation of Settlements.

National Social Welfare Assembly: International Committee.

United States Chamber of Commerce.

Polish American Congress.

National Grange.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, having submitted the names of more than 200 organizations, representing every shade of thought in religious faith, labor, philosophy, and civic attitude, I ask whether these great organizations can be considered to be unmindful of the interests and the welfare of the United States.

No, Mr. President, the fact of the matter is that all these organizations, representing every aspect and facet of American life, representing business and labor, and every kind of organization, Catholics, Jews, and Protestants, are pledged to the support of the principles of the substitute bill—the principle of expanding and liberalizing the displaced-persons program.

Mr. President, when the Displaced Persons Act was approved in 1948, President Truman said he signed it "with great reluctance." He stated that there were aspects of this legislation which "form a pattern of discrimination and intolerance wholly inconsistent with the American sense of justice." That became one of the issues in the presidential and congressional election of 1948. The people expressed their will. Their will was to oppose that discriminatory law.

Mr. President, if that law was discriminatory, what are we to think of this committee bill? The committee bill not only repeats and continues the provisions which the President of the United States labeled as discriminatory, but deepens and crystallizes those discriminations. I refer, among other provisions, to committee amendments Nos. 12, 18, 19, and 24; I refer also, and of course, to the complete negation of the purpose of the Displaced Persons Act in committee amendments 1, 2, and 3. These have been and will be discussed at greater length by other Members of the Senate.

But, Mr. President, I should like to cite a few facts which have a bearing on certain rumors and allegations which have been floating through the corridors and back Chambers of the Senate, although they have not been mentioned in debate. I would like to report to the Senate on the percentage of various nationalities and religions included among those properly called displaced persons. I am referring now to those for whom responsibility is acknowledged by the International Refugee Organization. Of the total number of actual displaced persons who are still in Europe, and in the Near and Far East, as of January of this year,

47 percent are Polish, 18 percent Baltic, 9 percent Yugoslav, 4 percent Russian, 4 percent Czechoslovak, and 18 percent of varied nationalities.

Analyzed by religious faiths, 41 percent are Catholic, 27 percent are Protestant and Orthodox Catholic, 8 percent are Jewish, and 24 percent are either unknown or other faiths.

The largest single group of displaced persons remaining in Europe today are Catholic. The Protestants are the next largest. Persons of Jewish faith now represent a very small percentage of the remaining displaced persons. They number less than 35,000. Most of the Jews formerly in the displaced-persons camps have gone to Israel.

Israel, incidentally, has taken a very large percentage of the so-called hard-core cases, the individuals who, because of age or physical disability, are not considered desirable immigrants. These are the people who could not be self-supporting and productive. But the little state of Israel announced only last week plans for the resettlement of every Jewish hard-core case in Europe, about 4,000 of them, involving about 9,000 people, who are to be brought to Israel and rehabilitated as far as possible. This will remove from Europe almost half the hard-core cases in the displaced-persons category.

Mr. President, I have been referring to the general aspects of displaced-persons legislation. I should like to speak now on the specific legislation before the Senate. Much as I disapprove of the present displaced-persons law, I would vastly prefer to have no amendments, to see no legislation enacted, than to approve the eviscerating amendments the committee has here reported.

Mr. President, I have heard members of the committee say that there is really not much difference between the McCarran bill and the substitute insofar as liberalization of the present law is concerned. It has been stated in the press and on this floor by proponents of the McCarran bill that all the objections to the original Displaced Persons Act have been met in the committee bill.

Mr. President, with all due respect to those who made such statements, I should like to say with as much emphasis as I can that if the McCarran bill purports to be a liberalization of the present Displaced Persons Act, it is a total delusion. In this connection I should like to say that an editorial published in the Saturday edition of the New York Times analyzes better than I could the differences between the McCarran bill and the substitute measure. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial I have referred to be inserted in my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACTION IN SIGHT

The fact that the Senate is nearing a show-down on amendments to the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 is cause for encouragement. For the enemies of liberalizing the measure have been engaged for many months in what amounts to a filibuster, and, to paraphrase JOHNSON, a filibuster is the last refuge of a politician who hasn't got the votes.

It was on June 2, 1949, that the House approved H. R. 4567, a bill which is not perfect, but which would make it possible for the United States to do its part effectively in helping the world wind up the existing DP problem. The principal features of this bill are an increase in the total number of admissible DP's and the elimination of certain arbitrary and highly restrictive provisions of the present law that have already seriously crippled its operation. As it has emerged from Senator McCARRAN's Judiciary Committee, the bill is almost unrecognizable—so much so that an impressive minority of the committee headed by Senator KILGORE are backing a substitute which strongly resembles H. R. 4567. If the Senate should pass the Kilgore proposals, there would be no difficulty in reconciling them with the original House bill. All friends of decent, responsible, workable DP legislation ought to support the Kilgore substitute in the Senate.

The first real test, however, is expected to come on one of Senator McCARRAN's pet schemes—a redefinition of the term "displaced person" which would in effect include the 8,000,000 German expellees, or Volksdeutsche. Adoption of this amendment would utterly wreck the existing DP program. While the IRO, which does not recognize the Volksdeutsche, is nearing the end of its existence, the proposed amendment would vastly complicate the DP problem by diluting the existing IRO list of a few hundred thousand DP's with the names of millions of so-called "ethnic Germans." To bring the latter en masse under DP legislation would cause hopeless confusion and administrative and financial difficulties beyond description. As it is, a considerable number of them are covered, in an orderly and practicable manner, in both the House and the Kilgore bill; but if anything is to be done about them on a really large scale, Senator McCARRAN has, as usual, proposed the worst possible method.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the McCarran bill not only breathes its dislike and distaste for displaced persons—for those generally recognized as displaced persons—but breathes its distaste for the Displaced Persons Commission. The United States Constitution proscribes bills of attainder. The McCarran bill is, in a sense, a bill of attainder against the Displaced Persons Commission, an American Government agency created by American law.

Much of the so-called evidence introduced into the hearings of the special Senate subcommittee deals with alleged maladministration on the part of the Displaced Persons Commission. If the Displaced Persons Commission has, in fact, violated its trust and misadministered the law, it is up to the executive branch of the Government to rectify that situation. All that the Congress can or should do is to strengthen the law. The proved loopholes in the law, its actual administrative weaknesses as shown by experience, are all taken care of in the substitute measure.

Mr. President, yesterday, I heard over the radio a debate on this displaced-persons legislation. One of the participants in that debate was Mr. Ugo Carusi, chairman of the Displaced Persons Commission.

Mr. Carusi said—and I hope I am quoting him with substantial accuracy—that if the allegations about maladministration of the displaced-persons program are true, then the remedy is in removing the members of the Displaced

Persons Commission, including Mr. Carusi. Mr. Carusi, however, disputes the charges that have been made and his assertions seem very convincing to me. But, in any case, the point is well taken. If the law is not being well administered, the administrators should be brought to account. The remedy is not in taking the necessary powers away from the Displaced Persons Commission.

Section 9 of the committee bill, Mr. President, which is committee amendment No. 25, gives to the Immigration and Naturalization Service and to the American Foreign Service the authority to determine eligibility under the Displaced Persons Act. This would, in effect, deprive the Displaced Persons Commission of its major function, in Europe. This section of the McCarran bill goes on to provide—

That the final determination of eligibility of applicants both under this act and under the general immigration laws of the United States shall be made exclusively by the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the American Foreign Service, both acting through persons who are citizens of the United States and who have had not less than 3 years' experience in the Immigration and Naturalization Service or in the American Foreign Service.

I have read a considerable amount of law, Mr. President, but I do not recall ever having read a law quite like this. Under these terms, Congress would not only tell the executive branch of the Government what to do, but how to do it, who is to do it, and what shall be the qualifications of the persons who are to do it.

Of course, Mr. President, all this administrative confusion reflected in the McCarran bill is due to the lack of understanding of the proper distinction between eligibility and admissibility. I think that is a confusion which exists widely, even in the Senate.

The Displaced Persons Commission has been given authority by law and by administrative regulation to determine which of the displaced persons in Europe are eligible to be disregarded as displaced persons under the terms of the law. The Displaced Persons Commission decides and should decide whether an applicant for the privileges of the Displaced Persons Act satisfies the date-line requirements and whether he satisfies the requirements as to national origin and circumstances of displacement. That is the only field in which the Displaced Persons Commission has the final word. This is all that comes under the heading of eligibility.

All the other factors which go into the decision of whether a displaced person should be admitted to the United States come under the heading of admissibility. These include such factors as moral character, health, whether the applicant is a security risk, his political background, and his likelihood of becoming a public charge.

In most of these matters the Displaced Persons Commission has the right to reject an applicant. And if he is rejected, neither the consular service nor the Immigration Service sees the applicant, because he has already been rejected.

But if the Displaced Persons Commission approves an application, the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the Foreign Service still have the final and complete veto power, on the basis of all the criteria of admissibility, including those contained in the Displaced Persons Act.

The regular immigration laws of the United States contain 20 or more grounds for barring a would-be immigrant from entering the United States. The Displaced Persons Act contains additional grounds. For any one of these reasons or for any combination of them, an immigration inspector or a consular officer of the United States can refuse to approve the application of a displaced person. The Displaced Persons Commission has no power or authority to overrule the consular service or the Immigration Service in these fields.

In cases where it can be shown, or where there is ground for reasonable belief that a displaced person has utilized fraudulent documents to obtain certification as a displaced person, the consular and Immigration Services have not only the full right but the duty to deny admittance.

I should like to emphasize again and again that these two branches of the Federal Government retain under the Displaced Persons Act all the power they possess under the normal immigration laws of the United States, plus additional powers granted them solely under the Displaced Persons Act.

The substitute bill retains and enhances these powers. The Ferguson-O'Connor amendment, which I shall support as a refinement to the Kilgore substitute, makes this even clearer than it is now.

There is no question in my mind that the Immigration Service and the consular service should have the final and absolute power to determine the admissibility of any displaced person into the United States. These services should be able—and are able—to reject any applicant who is a security risk. These services should have all the information they need or can obtain to aid them in determining whether an applicant is a security risk.

Mr. President, in connection with this confusion about eligibility and admissibility, one of the strangest confusions concerns the functions of the IRO. It has been charged that the IRO selects displaced persons for admission into the United States. This is a completely unfactual allegation. The IRO merely certifies certain individuals as being displaced persons under the definition of section 2 of the present Displaced Persons Act. It is the only organization which can so certify. In doing this the IRO serves the same function as a witness in a court proceeding. The witness identifies the individual in question. Whether that identification is upheld is a matter for court decision in the light of all the facts. The IRO is certainly a qualified and expert witness in this regard. But the IRO does not and cannot certify a person as an eligible displaced person. That is the function of the Dis-

placed Persons Commission and the IRO certainly cannot influence in one way or another the admissibility of a person. That is the function of the consular service and the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

The IRO no more selects persons for admission into the United States than a parish priest in Italy, in certifying the birth and nationality of a would-be immigrant under the Italian quota, selects that individual for admission into the United States. Actually the great majority of the nominations of individuals for consideration as eligible displaced persons are made by American citizens and American voluntary organizations.

I should like to point out that today on the average 330 out of every 1,000 applications received by the Displaced Persons Commission, including the certifications by the IRO, are eventually rejected by the United States Government agencies. Of these, 322 are rejected by the Displaced Persons Commission, 6 are rejected by the United States consuls, and 2 are rejected by the immigration inspectors. Long before the cases reach the consular and immigration services, almost all the poor security risks have already been rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] whether I may have 10 minutes more?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, if I have the right to yield any time to the distinguished Senator from New York I shall be happy to do so. Under the unanimous-consent agreement the time is controlled by the Senator from Nevada and the Senator from West Virginia.

Will it be agreeable for me to assume, on behalf of the Senator from West Virginia, the prerogative of yielding 5 minutes additional time to the Senator from New York?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to such yielding of time by the Senator from Tennessee, acting in behalf of the Senator from West Virginia, in his absence? The Chair hears no objection, and 5 minutes additional time is granted the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I shall have to cut my remarks short, of course, if I am granted only 5 minutes additional. Under such circumstances I would ask to have my prepared remarks printed in full in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection—

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, if there is no objection, I shall be willing to yield 10 minutes additional time to the distinguished Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair assumed that the Senator from Tennessee would try to find the Senator from West Virginia while the additional 5 minutes already granted the Senator from New York were being used. The Chair will appreciate it if that course is followed.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I am authorized by the Senator from West Virginia to yield 10 minutes additional time to the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That solves the problem. The Senator from New York is recognized for 10 minutes additional.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is quite satisfactory, Mr. President, and relieves me of the responsibility of acting in this connection.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, if the procedure proposed by the McCarran bill were to be approved, the power to reject would be taken out of the hands of the Displaced Persons Commission. The resultant load on the State Department and on the Immigration and Naturalization Service would, I believe, destroy the effectiveness of the security screening by those services.

Mr. President, there is a fable, by the French writer LaFontaine, about a man who decided that he would do a number of good deeds to help his neighbors. In each case, however, although he started out to do a good deed, he found himself mainly involved in protecting his own interests. Soon he became so obsessed with protecting his own rights that he lost sight of the fact that he was trying to do good deeds, and his neighbors came to hate him more cordially than if he had never started with his project in the first place.

I suggest, Mr. President, that there is somewhat of a parallel between that fable and our consideration of the displaced-persons problem. We started to carry out a humanitarian purpose. We started to discharge an international obligation. However, we have so hedged our undertaking with conditions that some of us have lost sight of our original objective.

No other subject in recent years has been so thoroughly studied, investigated, and reviewed. However, while the House committee was studying ways and means of remedying the discriminations in the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as well as the means of perfecting it generally, the special subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee was working from an entirely different angle, and was looking under every rock and bush for evidence to show that the displaced-persons law was not discriminatory enough.

The Senate Judiciary Subcommittee held more than 40 hearings on displaced-persons legislation. There reached my desk last Thursday more than 1,200 pages of testimony. Even that printed volume was incomplete. Some of the hearings referred to on the cover of that record are not included in it.

In my own judgment, the testimony given before the subcommittee, when taken as a whole, does not support the charges which have been made on this floor against the displaced-persons program. For every charge, the record contains an answer. It would be useless to engage in refuting one statement or another.

It seems to me that the McCarran bill and the substitute, when taken side by

side, tell the story. If we are to settle the displaced-persons problem once and for all, if we are to honor our international obligations, if we are to do what we set out to do, what we promised the people of America we would do—to liberalize the displaced-persons law—there can be no question of what our action will be when we vote on these amendments.

Let me remind the Senate that what we have before us is legislation for displaced persons—not for any displaced persons, not for persons who happen to be displaced anywhere in the world, but for the displaced persons, for the displaced persons defined in the IRO constitution, for the ones whom we are supporting, and to whose support we are pledged. Unless we cling to this definition, we are lost. If we abandon this definition, and cut ourselves loose from it, we shall find ourselves in deep waters indeed. So far as the displaced-persons program is concerned, we shall then have scuttled it.

Under the McCarran definition, a true displaced person would have little chance, if any, of ever entering the United States. Mr. President, I should like to submit to the judgment of every Member of this body and of every American citizen what the effect of such legislation would be on our international relations. In my own opinion, its effect would be to feed the fires of Communist propaganda in Europe more than would be done by any other single thing we could do. Its effect would be to renege on our pledged word and to make the pledged faith of the United States a mockery throughout the world.

However, I do not need to express merely my own opinion. I can quote the words of the Secretary of State of the United States, who, in response to a letter which I wrote to him, has written to me as follows:

MARCH 31, 1950.

The Honorable HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR LEHMAN: I have received your letter of March 27, 1950, requesting my opinion as to the impact on our prestige and general relations abroad of alternate proposals now under consideration by the Senate to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948.

Since 1945 the reduction of the numbers of refugees and displaced persons in central Europe has been an important element of United States foreign policy. Their continuing presence in central Europe delays the restoration of peace and order in that area which is a primary objective of the United States. I therefore welcome the opportunity which your letter affords to stress once more that the United States has a common objective with other peace-loving nations to resolve this problem at the earliest possible moment. Moreover we have accepted the responsibilities of leadership among the free democracies to give support to the forces aligned against totalitarian regimes. Included among the refugees and displaced persons are those who have made great personal sacrifices in this struggle and have been forced to flee in search of asylum where freedom of self-expression and the dignity of the individual are respected. To meet these responsibilities, it is essential that we do our part in receiving an appropriate number of refugees and displaced persons in the light of comparable action by other governments.

It is the judgment of the Department of State that H. R. 4567 and the substitute measure sponsored by 18 Members of the Senate referred to in your letter go further toward meeting the requirements of these considerations than other measures now before the Senate.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN ACHESON.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question at this point?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Is it not a fact that we are now laboring to strengthen our international position by means of the use of our money, and in every other way we can, looking toward a better understanding with the nations that are friendly to us?

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator is absolutely correct. Let me add that I know what our Government has been doing to strengthen our relations with the democracies of western Europe. I was there when Russia and the satellite countries wanted to force these poor, unfortunate people to go back behind the iron curtain. We in UNRRA and those in the United Nations fought against that; and in concert with the other democracies, the United States worked wholeheartedly in the effort to give asylum and safety to these people.

Mr. KILGORE. Does the Senator agree that the program, as envisaged from the international viewpoint, took into consideration the definition and the registration of certain types of persons by an international organizations known as the International Refugee Organization, of which the United States is one of the participating parties, and of which the nations which are friendly to us and to our theory are the other participating parties? Is not that correct?

Mr. LEHMAN. That is correct.

Mr. KILGORE. Therefore, if we repudiate the agreement, on the basis of which the International Refugee Organization was set up, and on the basis of which its constitution and bylaws were adopted, we shall be going back on the nations who have lived up to its bylaws and who are carrying out the obligations they have assumed under those bylaws and under the same definition; is that correct?

Mr. LEHMAN. The distinguished Senator from West Virginia is absolutely correct.

Mr. KILGORE. Therefore, we would be introducing a disturbing factor into the international picture, and it would serve to upset the State Department's activities looking toward international cooperation; is that correct?

Mr. LEHMAN. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. President, let me add, in further answer to the Senator's question, that it is an amazing thing, which is not well understood, that neither Russia, nor, so far as I know, any of the satellite countries, are members of the IRO. The IRO is composed of the liberty-loving, democratic nations.

Mr. President, I know that testimonials and statements in favor of or against any proposition are always sub-

ject to some discount. I do not expect that the Senate will be swayed one way or the other by them. I think the Senate will make its decision on the basis of the facts, as they are adduced from all the credible and established evidence.

Yet, I can think of no better way to conclude my remarks this afternoon than to quote the remarks of an Army officer who spent many months in direct contact with displaced persons, an officer whose job it was to know and to observe the displaced persons.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has again expired.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, does the Senator from New York desire to have further time granted to him?

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes; perhaps a half minute or a minute more.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New York whatever further time he requires to conclude his remarks.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator. Mr. President, Lt. Col. Jerry M. Sage, of the United States Army, formerly attached to the European command, wrote as follows in the New York Herald Tribune of March 3, 1949:

If I were asked to point out the community which I considered the least susceptible to and the most thoroughly indoctrinated against nazism, fascism, and communism, I would not take you to the isolated 100-percent American small town in the Midwest. I would take you to a DP center in our zone of Germany.

Mr. President, there is so much more that could be said. Many of my colleagues have pointed out, and will point out in the course of this debate, additional factors calling for the adoption of the substitute bill and the rejection of the McCarran amendments. This is not a political issue. It is not a technical issue. It is a humanitarian issue. It is an issue where righteousness in all its vigor stands clearly in support of the substitute measure.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I have been trying to proceed in an orderly manner with the various committee amendments, but at this time, I desire to accommodate the Senator from California, who has a specific question which will come up further in the bill, which he would like to discuss. Inasmuch as it will be inconvenient for him to discuss it at a later hour, I therefore yield 15 minutes to the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wanted to discuss the special case of the so-called White Russian refugees who are now on the island of Samar, in the Philippines. I recall—and I think it important that the Senate recognize the fact—that most of these people originally were driven from Russia at the time of the Bolshevik revolution of 1917. Some of them had been identified with the old czarist regime. Some had been identified with the liberal government of Alexander Kerensky. Some had been identified with the various non-Communist

leaders who fought during the Russian civil war. All of them felt that their lives would be in danger if they remained in Russia; and, of course, many of those who remained behind were liquidated, or are still in Siberia, in the salt mines or elsewhere. These people went into various cities of China, not only Shanghai, but Tientsin, Peking, and into many other communities. There, starting from scratch, because most of them came out with only the clothes on their backs and what few possessions they could carry with them, they began once again to build their lives and to raise their families.

During the Chinese Communist revolution, which has more recently taken place, they realized once again that if they fell into the hands of the Chinese Communist forces it would not be unlikely that the Soviet Union would request of the Chinese Communist Government that they be turned over to the Russian Government, to be taken back, either to be liquidated or put into concentration camps. Therefore, once again, after having rebuilt their lives, they were forced to flee for safety.

I think we might commend the Government of the Republic of the Philippines in that, during the emergency situation when there was no other place to which these people might go, it provided within the Philippines, on the island of Samar and a neighboring area, a camp for them.

Last November and December, when I was in the Far East, I flew from Manila to the island of Samar to visit the camp. I found the caliber of the people to be very high. Not only had they done much to improve the rather inadequate living quarters which were available to them, but they were keeping up their spirits and were endeavoring to educate their children and to provide normal community facilities. They had their own police force, they had their own fire department, they had their own schools, they had their own training centers in which to teach the boys who were older trades of various kinds. Many of these White Russians, over the years, have lived in the State of California, as well as in other States of the Union, and I have found them to be excellent citizens. I may say by way of passing that no one needs to convince them that communism is not the proper way of life.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator is doubtless aware of the fact that there are two definitions of the term "White Russian." One affects a certain part of Russia only; the other affects a group which was opposed, and has been opposed since the revolution, to the Soviet government. I wanted the Senator to clarify his use of the term "White Russian." I think I understand what he means by it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator. The question he raises is a very natural one, and one which, of course, should be clarified. I use the term in the broad sense of being not a Communist Russian, rather than as merely being from that small area in Russia called White Russia. I use it in its broad

application and meaning, as denoting a non-Communist Russian who was driven from his country, regardless of the geographical area from which he was driven. Does that clarify the situation?

Mr. KILGORE. If I may say so to the Senator, those to whom the Senator refers constitute the same group that we went into Russia and Siberia to help, at the end of World War I. They are the descendants or the followers of the same group we and other nations went into Russia to assist.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct, though substantially it may be even a little broader than that, because in the first phases of the Russian revolution there were undoubtedly many Russians who thought communism would turn out to be much better than it did, and when they once had the opportunity of seeing the police-state method in operation, doing away with their freedom of religion, even in later years, they turned and tried to get from under the totalitarian state which had been created.

Mr. President, I believe the committee inadvertently stated something in its report, on page 2, paragraph (2), which it did not intend, about halfway down the page. It reads:

(2) Four thousand displaced persons who were in Shanghai, China. It is the information of the committee that the persons sought to be embraced who are presently in Shanghai could not practically be removed because of the Communist domination of China and that most of those persons who have succeeded in leaving China have been resettled.

As I have said, I think information may have gotten to the committee inadvertently which caused it to include that paragraph; whereas, if the cold facts were available to them, they would agree that a change was needed. The fact of the matter is that about 5,000 were originally moved, not only from Shanghai alone, because that would be too narrow a definition, but also from Tientsin, Peking, and certain other cities. Some of them have been originally, prior to the Russian revolution, in China, at Harbin and in other places in Manchuria, as employees of the Chinese Eastern Railway and other Russian or partially owned Russian enterprises in the country. So, as the Communist tide in China increased, they kept being pushed down until it finally was true that most of them ended up in the pocket of Shanghai, and had to be evacuated. About 5,000 of them were evacuated, largely with the help of IRO, and through the assistance of our own State Department in urging that prompt action be taken. They were evacuated both by ship and plane to the Philippines, where, through the good offices of the Philippine Government, the camp to which I have referred was made available to them.

Mr. President, on my visit to the camp I could help being impressed with the fact that these people were living under conditions which were not meant to be permanent. Most of the places wherein they dwelt were canvas tents; and the canvas was not very good. I happened to be there shortly after a heavy rain—and they have heavy rains in that part

of the tropical Philippines—and in the tents there were many holes. The bedding and clothing in many of the tents were soaked through, because of the rain. The IRO officials there, I think, were doing the best they could with what they had. They told me that some fresh canvas was coming in, so that the worst of the tents could be taken care of. The few permanent buildings were structures which had formerly been an American naval establishment, I believe, buildings of the temporary character we are accustomed to see in American Army camps. They had fixed those up to serve as hospitals. White Russian women were acting as nurses. They had doctors who were helping these people. There was a fine group of children who were attending the schools which had been set up for the education of the children.

I may later wish to modify the amendment which I offered this morning, in order that we may be sure that these people on the Island of Samar have some consideration. The amendment reads as follows:

On page 4, line 21, immediately after the word "resettled", insert a semicolon and the following: "or (5) on July 1, 1948 or on the effective date of this act, as amended, resided in China as a displaced person or refugee, as defined in annex I (except par. 1 (b) of sec. A of pt. I thereof) of the constitution of the International Refugee Organization."

On page 10, lines 8 and 9, strike out the words "three hundred and twenty thousand" and insert in lieu thereof the words "three hundred and twenty-four thousand."

On page 10, line 24, immediately following the word "Act", insert a semicolon and the following: "and (5) not more than four thousand visas shall be issued to eligible displaced persons who are eligible displaced persons as defined in subsection (b) (5) of section 2 of this act."

The amendment on page 10, lines 8 and 9, is designed to take care of the approximately 4,000 White Russians who are still in the Philippines, in the temporary camp.

Mr. President, I have several communications which I should like to read and have made a part of my remarks, because I think they will give a better understanding to the Senate and to the Nation of the problem which is faced by these persons. One communication is a cablegram addressed to me as follows:

Hon. Senator KNOWLAND,

Washington, D. C.:

January 25, 1950, Senate Judiciary Committee report stated "Most of those persons who succeeded in leaving China have been resettled" is incorrect. Out of 5,500 evacuated from Shanghai to Samar only 2,300 resettled up to date and 3,200 still remain in camp. Three thousand eagerly await their chance immigrate United States of America to join their parents, children, relative, and close friend.

BOLOGOFF.

I also have, Mr. President, a very interesting letter which was personally handed to me by a committee when I was at the camp on the Island of Samar, and I should like to read it to the Senate. It reads as follows:

TUBABAO, November 1949.

Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,

United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: We live in an incredibly hard time. * * * At present all moral

principles have been shattered, humanitarian ideas have at least partly lost their hold, and no great truth is held in proper esteem. It is frightening to live in the world where man becomes a tool valued only on the basis of his youth and strength, where people over 45 are regarded as a waste, where elderly people are deprived of their sole joy, the companionship of their families.

Unfortunately we were more than mere witnesses of this new world order when a mission that came to this camp selected for their country not people but working power in the form of our flourishing youth, but at the same time deprived them of the right to take along their fathers and mothers.

We, the mothers of naturalized American citizens, and we the mothers of wives of American citizens, derived our strength for struggle from the thought that beyond the ocean there is a country to whom we gave honest citizens, our children, whom we have brought up, and our grandchildren born already upon American soil. In this land family is still held as something sacred and the name of mother is holy. For years we have been living in hope of being reunited with our children to help them in their homes and to take part in the upbringing of our grandchildren. Having completed all necessary legal preliminaries we were patiently waiting for our turn to receive immigration visas when suddenly the Red tornado which broke out over China carried us away to the almost equatorial isle of Tubabao.

We have been assured that our stay here will be only a short one and that it would be only a brief stop-over on our way to the United States. We readily believed as we were convinced that we shall not be forgotten and lost as even the GI prayer book contained a prayer for mothers.

Alas, it is over 9 months that we have been not really living but existing somehow under the burning sun in tents devoid of minimum comfort receiving only inadequate food. We live on an island where during the war an American soldier would be permitted to remain only for a short time to avoid complete loss of health. But the soldiers were young men of the age of our children, but we are women whose lives are drawing to the end.

During the 9 months of our residence in this part of the world only 70 to 80 immigration visas were granted against the total of 5,000 people living in this camp. Where shall we find the strength to hope and to wait. This letter ought to be written with the blood and tears rather than upon a typewriter. We hope that the cry of our hearts in pain would reach your heart.

In the name of your mother we beg you, help us to unite with our children.

MOTHERS ON TUBABAO ISLAND.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wonder if the Senator from West Virginia will give me 5 minutes additional time.

Mr. KILGORE. I yield five additional minutes to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the letter which I have just read lists, with their signatures, the persons mentioned; and I should like to have printed in the Record their names, and those of their children who are now American citizens, living in this country, and who will be glad to welcome their parents into their homes and to assist them so that they shall not present a problem. I hope each Member of the Senate will go over this list, because, while not all of the 48 States are referred to, I think it will be found to contain references to many States of the Union. I see Oklahoma City, Okla.; Cleveland, Ohio; Indiana,

California, Nevada, the State of Washington, and many others. The sons, grandsons, and granddaughters of these people are citizens of the United States.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

F. P. Romanenko; daughter, Mrs. Spooner, Ocean Side, Calif.
Z. P. Churilina; daughter, G. Churilina, San Francisco, Calif.
K. Urina; daughter, Mrs. Roy G. Fairfield, Wiscasset, Maine.
V. P. Baranoff; daughter, Mrs. Raymond Curtis, Tucson, Ariz.
E. M. Vlasoff; daughter, Mrs. Henry Ladle, Graham, Wash.
T. S. Bogomiagkova; daughter, Mrs. A. Safaros, Troy, N. Y.
E. Lukashik; daughter, Mrs. E. Cochrum, Fresno, Calif.
M. M. Koolikoff; two daughters, Mrs. G. W. Smith, Grants Pass, Oreg.; Mrs. P. A. Lashkoff, San Francisco, Calif.
E. Krupin; two daughters, H. N. Loukianoff, O. N. Zoubirilin, San Francisco, Calif.
A. A. Verhovsky; son, A. A. Verhovsky, San Francisco, Calif.
Z. Pavlovsky; daughter, Helen Musser, White Plains, N. Y.
A. N. Skorniakoff; daughter, Mrs. Julia Goodwin, Rocky Ford, Colo.
M. G. Pavlovskaya; daughter, Mrs. F. B. Griffiths, Newport News, Va.
H. L. Tretiakoff; daughter, Mrs. L. Rusher, Oklahoma City.
M. P. Sokoloff; son, Michael Sokoloff, New York, N. Y.
M. Wunder; two daughters and son, Mrs. C. E. Watrt, Cleveland, Ohio.
L. Ryl.
E. F. Voropaeva; son, Victor Voropaev, San Francisco, Calif.
A. A. Shick; daughter, M. Caro, San Francisco, Calif.
E. P. Jlejin; daughter, C. B. Ward, Abilene, Tex.
K. A. Baranoff; daughter, Margaret Miller, Brooklyn, N. Y.
F. S. Martiniuk; daughter, L. Rasmussen, Corpus Christi, Tex.
G. R. Dedulin; daughter, Mrs. W. W. Cockran, Klamath Falls, Oreg.
V. Lavroff; daughter, Mrs. Gene R. Edwards, Columbia City, Ind.
B. Matchougovskaya; daughter, Mrs. N. S. Solovieff, San Francisco, Calif.
V. A. Zadorojnaya; daughter, Sokolik, San Francisco, Calif.
Zolotareva; daughter, Mrs. A. M. Chrisler, Arcadia, Calif.
A. F. Polushin; son, V. E. Polushin, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Nina Kudriasheva; son, Gus. Constantino, Brooklyn, N. Y.
E. V. Kouznetsova; daughters, Mrs. N. Boucher, Washington, D. C.; N. A. Woodward, Washington, D. C.
M. P. Fedina; daughter, Vera Adams, Reno, Nev.
E. S. Pavlichenko; daughter, O. E. Crostwaite, San Francisco, Calif.
V. V. Matkovsky; daughter, V. C. Matkovsky, San Francisco, Calif.
M. P. Ykousheva; daughter, Mrs. R. Townsend, San Francisco, Calif.
P. G. Mihaloff; son, V. V. Mihaloff, Seattle, Wash.
M. G. Shuisky; son, G. P. Shuisky, Oakland, Calif.
A. Ermolaev; daughter, Ksenia Dimitri, New York City, N. Y.
K. Promptoff; son, V. Promptoff, Berkeley, Calif.
L. S. Fionina; daughter, Mrs. F. S. Hudson, Wyoming, N. Y.
A. Ustimenko; daughter, Mrs. T. E. Sumwalt, Hartford City, Ind.
M. Sokolovskaya; daughter, B. G. Hodge, Parris Island, S. C.

Z. Maysheff; daughter, Mrs. Rogers, San Francisco, Calif.
I. A. Doohovnikoff; daughter, Max L. Garrison, Wichita, Kans.
M. Shulepova; daughter, Mrs. T. Disharoon, Godman Air Force Base, Fort Knox, Ky.
A. Ivanovska; son, R. M. Ivanovski, Ithaca, N. Y.
S. M. Kohlmaekoff; daughter, Olga Kohl, Paducah, Ky.
T. D. Belitsky; daughter, Mrs. Richard Winters, Cherry Point, N. C.
E. F. Zrojevsky.
D. M. Markoff; son, A. Markoff, St. Bruno, Calif.
A. Ankoudinova; daughter, Mrs. N. Boen, Muskogee, Okla.
P. G. Medvedeff-Beer; daughter Mrs. Helen Walker, New York.
M. Poletaeva; daughter, M. Woolworth, Hood, Tex.
A. Andreeff; daughter, Mrs. J. K. Dixon, Camp Pendleton, Calif.
L. W. Ryl; daughter, Mrs. J. E. Balles, Chicago, Ill.
N. Reuter; daughter, Mrs. Malcolm Riddle, Alexandria, Va.
L. Geystor; daughter, Mrs. F. A. Young, Portsmouth, Va.
E. Sheveleff; granddaughter, Mrs. Nolan Lee, Chattanooga, Tenn.
Olga A. Morosoff; son, Boris Morosoff, Lakewood, N. J.
V. V. Sapelkin; daughter, Mrs. G. Skidel-sky, New York, N. Y.
M. C. Bialokoz; daughter, O. V. Miram, San Francisco, Calif.
O. V. Klinghardt; daughter, Mrs. A. Karzenslein, Astoria, Oreg.
Z. V. Skobolina-Pinaeff; daughter, V. Skobolina, San Francisco, Calif.
A. V. Pistrulova; son, Mr. V. I. Pistrulova, San Francisco, Calif.
O. P. Agafonoff; son, E. V. Agafonoff, Oakland, Calif.
M. Merdiniantz; son, George Merdiniantz, San Francisco, Calif.
A. N. L. Sina; daughter, Mrs. Vera Lawrence, Monterey, Calif.
Z. E. Kosih; son, Nickolay Kosih, United States Fort Dix, N. J.
A. P. Pastoochoff; son, P. M. Pastoochoff, San Francisco, Calif.
Mariys Chernykh; daughter, A. R. Smith, Petersburg, Va.
E. M. Boiko; daughter, Anna Milkay, Bethel, Wash.
M. K. Agafonoff; daughter, Xenia Shlimanovsky, San Francisco, Calif.
V. Maslovsky; son, V. A. Maslovsky, Seattle, Wash.
A. K. Zitynskaya; daughter, Mrs. N. Ruskin, North Hollywood, Calif.
M. K. Dashitsky; daughter, H. Jeavons, Vermillion, Ohio.
P. M. Vasilenko; daughter, Mrs. R. H. Gamble, Portland, Oreg.
V. K. Mamaeva; daughter, E. A. Yan, Homestead, Pa.
I. A. Radina; daughter, V. A. Martin-Postovsky, Oakland, Calif.
Aprelkova; daughter, Mrs. J. Welschmeyer, Oakland, Calif.
L. Orloff; daughter, L. F. Bradley, Paramount, Calif.
E. Y. Petrikina; daughter, Mrs. J. T. Sommers, North Hollywood, Calif.
Kostulskaya; three daughters, E. P. Lindemuth, Washington, D. C.; W. Illis, Jongs-town, Ohio; L. R. Landenwitch, Detroit, Mich.
V. Binnitskaya; daughter, N. Stanley, Jackson, Ariz.
E. Feldger; daughter, R. T. Parker, Hutchinson, Kans.
I. K. Bagranuk; daughter, Mrs. L. H. Boynton, West Sterling, Mass.
O. M. Zung; daughter, Mrs. Herman, Gettysburg, Pa.
P. D. Maltzell; daughter, Mrs. C. Volk, San Francisco, Calif.

B. D. Grosheva; daughter, Mrs. O. J. Smith, Waukegan, Ill.

A. A. Holkina; daughter, L. Bengen, Brooklyn, N. Y.

A. P. Rogova; daughter, Mrs. J. Muttart, Seattle, Wash.

V. V. Daniel; two daughters, Mrs. C. Lieusay, Ventura, Calif.; Mrs. J. Holtz, Norfolk, Va.

A. T. Botova; daughter, Mrs. V. J. De Laren, Kansas, City, Mo.

M. P. Zyrianova; daughter, K. V. Wright, San Francisco, Calif.

V. D. Yakovlev; daughter, Mrs. H. P. Young, Trenton, N. J.

H. P. Voronoff; son, Mr. N. N. Voronoff, San Francisco, Calif.

H. Reinbach; daughter, Mrs. A. Perry, San Francisco, Calif.

A. K. Polovneff; daughter, Mrs. L. Atkinson, Cantil, Calif.

M. Y. Zamlatina; daughter, Mrs. I. Rovunds, New Mexico.

M. Babaiantz; daughter, Mrs. N. Tchakallan, San Francisco, Calif.

M. Krloff; daughter, Mrs. A. Bessette, Poultny, Vt.

V. J. Miram; son, A. V. Miram, San Francisco, Calif.

M. F. Slesarenko; daughter, Mrs. B. Horton, Bradford, Okla.

A. A. Bechkova; daughter, Mrs. T. Wenger, Corpus Christi, Tex.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, because of the limitation of time, I also ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a letter dated February 27, 1950, signed by G. K. Bologoff, leader of the Russian national group in the camp on the island of Samar, which I think will explain the weakness in the bill as it came from the House of Representatives and as reported by the committee.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TUBABAO, SAMAR, PHILIPPINES,
February 27, 1950.

Hon. Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: Many thanks for your letter of February 7, enclosing the amendments you intend to propose to the bill (H. R. 4567) to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948. I wish you would know how we all here at Samar, appreciate your efforts to help us to be admitted to America.

Comparing your amendments and those proposed by the Committee on the Judiciary, which I received but a few days ago, with the original bill, I noticed that the amendment by the Committee on the Judiciary excluded our group entirely, while your amendment may not include a considerable part of the refugees which are still here.

The stipulation of the original bill that "A number of immigration visas not to exceed 4,000 may be issued . . . to displaced persons or refugees as defined in annex I (except par. 1 (b) of sec. A of pt. I thereof) of the constitution of the International Refugee Organization . . ." though seemingly somewhat vague, did well cover the situation, for although not being displaced persons, all of us were considered refugees before the outbreak of the Second World War for reasons of political opinion.

There were among us people of several categories, i. e.—

1. Persons who emigrated to China during the period from October 1917 to January 1, 1925.

2. Persons who were not able to leave Russia at the time of the evacuation of the white armies, but have succeeded in escaping during the subsequent years. Among these was a very large group of refugees who crossed the border into the Sinkiang Province

of China between 1927 and 1935. About 250 of them are now in our camp.

3. Persons who emigrated after October 1917 to different countries of Europe and Asia and came to China at different times up to the outbreak of the Second World War.

4. Persons who were already settled in Manchuria prior to 1917, being mostly employed by the Chinese Eastern Railway, and who left Manchuria because of fear of persecution by the Communists.

5. Children, grandchildren, and lawful spouses of persons mentioned in 1 to 5.

The provisions of the amendments qualifying as displaced persons only those of us who "emigrated to China in the period from October 1917 to January 1, 1925," would have the effect that many of the persons mentioned under 2 and most of those under 3 and 4 would not be covered by the amended bill on account of one of the following reasons:

(a) As having left Russia (though definitely for political reasons) after January 1, 1925.

(b) As having initially emigrated not to China but to some country of Europe or Asia.

(c) As having been settled in China before October 1917.

Owing to the fact that out of the 5,472 persons evacuated to the island of Samar from Shanghai, some 2,300 have already left the camp to countries of permanent resettlement, I cannot give you the exact statistical data as to how many of the remaining, say 3,200 persons, would be adversely affected by the amendments. However, the approximate number is about 300 persons, or nearly 10 percent of the whole number of refugees who are still awaiting their resettlement.

I would highly appreciate your taking into consideration the facts as outlined above, and trust the Senate may find it possible to have the bill worded in such a way as to enable all the Samar refugees to have an equal chance for being admitted into the United States.

Sincerely yours,

G. K. BOLOGOFF,
Leader, Russian National Group,
UNEC, Tubabao, Samar.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, as we enter into the final discussion leading to decisive action on the pending matter, it is desirable to evaluate the merits of the issues involved. One of the most important of these issues is that of the definition of a displaced person. A basic requirement to any effective, fair, and workable displaced persons law is the definition of a displaced person, together with the establishment of a cut-off date which would clearly and for all time remove any question of discrimination. How must we determine the definition of a displaced person whom we want to be considered as eligible for the benefits of this great humanitarian program?

From the very outset, we have recognized that the problem of the displaced person is one requiring international consideration and agreement for its ultimate solution. The United States did not seek to solve this problem without the active cooperation and partnership of other nations of good will which, like us, were in a position to offer a haven to these homeless and oppressed people. When the

problem of the displaced persons was first considered within the structure of the United Nations, the American delegation made it clear that an international organization was necessary, and that all nations should contribute to its support, morally, financially, and by actually opening their doors to a fair share of these people.

The only real objection to the establishment of an international organization to deal with this problem came from the representatives of the Soviet Union and one of her satellites. This opposition sought to brand the displaced persons as war criminals, traitors and collaborators. Their only solution to the problem of millions of uprooted people was forcible repatriation.

Despite the unyielding position of the Soviet representatives on this question, the western nations, in no small measure aided by the forceful stand taken by the United States delegation, drew up the constitution of the International Refugee Organization. To say that perfection was attained would be highly inaccurate. But the liberty-loving nations stood together and accepted this constitution as a means of initiating the activities necessary to solve the problem of those displaced persons who could not, with safety to their lives and liberties, return to their native lands.

It is significant to note that today the International Refugee Organization is supported solely by those nations which have been forced to group themselves together for purposes of common security against the threat of the latest world aggressor.

I cite a list of the member nations of the International Refugee Organization: Australia, Belgium, Canada, China, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, France, Guatemala, Iceland, Luxemburg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, the United Kingdom, the United States of America, and Venezuela.

If we depart, at this late stage of this humanitarian undertaking, from unwavering support of the International Refugee Organization, we shall defeat our own enlightened self-interest. In so doing we shall serve notice on the other nations who have stood with us in the fight to make the International Refugee Organization a workable organization that we feel we have made a mistake in projecting this world-wide effort to provide homes and gainful employment to deserving human beings.

We must not lose sight of the fact that those unfortunate victims of totalitarian aggression who are still in the displaced persons camps and assembly centers of Germany, Austria, and Italy are looking to us to lead the way to a solution of their urgent problem, and we must not take from them what little hope they have left of once more regaining a normal way of life in a country where their basic freedoms will be guaranteed.

The first question before us for decision is the definition of a displaced person. Mr. President, the definition goes to the very heart of the legislation for whether or not we will have a workable and effective displaced persons program, designed to solve the problem for all

time, will depend almost entirely upon how we define a displaced person.

Under the terms of the existing statute, the definition of a displaced person is identical with that contained in the constitution of the IRO. The committee bill would substitute a new definition, which would include not only the displaced persons for whom the IRO now has responsibility, but also approximately 8,000,000 expellees. Under IRO procedures, displaced persons are cared for in IRO camps and staging areas prior to their departure for various countries of resettlement. Their transportation is paid by the Organization from points of departure in Europe to points of debarkation in the United States. All of the expenses entailed in this operation are paid for by the IRO.

Thus, if we accept the definition contained in the committee bill, the United States will be required to establish camps and staging areas in various parts of Germany and Austria, at tremendous expense, in order to arrange for the admission of these persons to this country. In addition, all transportation costs from Europe, to the United States will have to be paid for by this Government. Finally, there are only a limited number of visas available for displaced persons. If expellees are to be included as displaced persons, the number of visas available will be watered down considerably, since every expellee admitted to the United States as a displaced person will result in the admission of one less IRO displaced person.

The substitute bill, Mr. President, provides for a fund to take care of these expenses, so only the substitute bill would make adequate and realistic provision for these persons.

We are not unmindful that there are other groups of persons, innocent victims of a world upset by the uprooting of whole populations. In fact, we are fully mindful of the problem of the expellees and refugees of German ethnic origin. As evidence of the careful and studied attention in this matter, I invite your consideration of section 12 of the substitute bill. The basic purpose of this section is to demonstrate our humanitarian concern for the plight of these expellees and refugees of German ethnic origin.

The language of this section clearly shows that we are taking the proper means of making possible the entry into the United States of a number of these victims of world chaos, and under conditions and procedures which exactly parallel those which now apply to the displaced persons under the care of the International Refugee Organization. It is fair to state that unless the conditions outlined in section 12 of the substitute bill are applied to the expellees, they will continue to suffer from neglect, and the misunderstanding which now attends this matter will in no measure be diminished.

I strongly urge continuing support of the original definition of displaced persons as contained in the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 with the cut-off date for eligibility changed from December 22, 1945, to January 1, 1949. I urge this because only by our continuing support

of this definition can we bring about the early termination of the displaced-persons problem. This end can be attained with success before June 30, 1951. I need hardly inform any Member of the Senate that the successful termination of the International Refugee Organization will mean a considerable reduction in the appropriation of tax moneys. This will be a welcome relief to the already overburdened taxpayer. This should give us added encouragement in arriving at a decision of definitions which will be based solely on the merits of the issues involved.

Measurable progress toward completion of our pledge has been made through the instrumentality of IRO. Extensive records have been assembled of those persons who have come under their jurisdiction, but only of that group. If we were at this late date, suddenly, and divorced from other cooperating nations, to undertake an entirely different undertaking, it would not only disrupt the original plan but would necessitate an entirely new set-up with resulting delays, confusion, and untold expense.

It is worth repeating that registration records are available only for IRO subjects. The large group of German ethnics, deserving as they are, should be treated separately and distinctly, rather than to commingle two essentially different elements which cannot be handled through one instrumentality.

All the successive steps through established facilities—the processing centers, resettlement centers, and holding centers—have been arranged and have been functioning for this extended period, and have no relation to the German ethnic group. It would be disruptive and revolutionary to change this machinery overnight. It would delay indefinitely the termination of IRO which target date is now in the foreseeable future.

In preferring to concentrate on IRO cases, rather than to inaugurate a new plan at this late date, we need not forego any of the security provisions which it is deemed advisable to adopt to exclude undesirables from this country. We can follow the definition of displaced persons as hitherto accepted by the large group of nations associated in this international undertaking, and still affix any conditions to their entry to this country which the Congress may deem proper. In other words, we need not weaken any of our restrictions under the regular immigration laws, but, on the contrary, may and should establish additional safeguards to protect the interests of our country.

As a matter of fact, I express the hope that the Senate will adopt and write into the law ironclad provisions that United States officials must have the final decision as to who is admitted to our country and that every possible screening requirement be followed to exclude those who are unworthy of entry.

I favor the admittance of a sizable number of German ethnics. However, their problem is a different one from the displaced-persons group, as handled by the nations associated together in this undertaking. It would be a disservice to the deserving German ethnics to con-

fuse their cases with those of the other group. Yet it would be inconsistent to exclude their members simply because we have embarked several years ago on the displaced-persons program.

The wiser course to pursue would be to admit the 54,744, as provided in the Kilgore substitute, as a separate undertaking and through careful selections. Meanwhile this country should join in a continuing survey and thoroughgoing study with other nations to arrive at a long-range plan for the handling of this involved problem. By this means alone will there be a final solution. For us to take a lone stab at this question will not produce satisfactory results.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'CONOR. I prefer not to yield at this time, and I ask the Senator to be good enough to allow me to continue. I shall be glad to yield at the end of my remarks.

If the problem of resettling the original groups of displaced persons in the camps and assembly centers of Europe was deserving of the concerted study and attention given to it by the nations of good will throughout the world—and I am convinced that it was—then surely the fate of these 8,000,000 expellees of German ethnic origin is of similar urgency, and similarly deserving of the combined assistance of all the nations hitherto concerned.

Only through such an approach can there be avoided the disruption of the current progress and procedures by which the displaced-persons problem as we have known it since the end of the war would be cleared up completely and promptly.

Only with the assistance of the various nations concerned in the present displaced-persons program could we hope to arrive finally at any solution of the expellee problem which would be more than a gesture. With all the sympathy in the world for these people who have been unjustly and sometimes violently displaced from their homes by the ruthless tactics of totalitarian conquest, one must be realistic. The fact must be faced that the job is too big for the United States to handle alone. Likewise, it is too complicated to be attacked overnight. Particularly must these considerations be kept in mind when it is realized that a decision to merge the two problems, as the definition in the committee bill proposes to do, would accomplish little more than to upset the present progress toward final settlement of the displaced-persons problem of the past few years.

Mr. President, for the reasons which I have stated, I endorse wholeheartedly the so-called Kilgore substitute bill, and shall vote for its adoption.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] suggests that a quorum call be had at this time, with the time to be charged equally to both sides. Therefore, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and request that the time necessary for the call be charged equally to each side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, may I ask the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] if he is willing to join with me in asking unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that the further proceedings under the call be suspended?

Mr. McCARRAN. I am willing that the further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I make that request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the order for the quorum call will be rescinded and further proceedings under the call will be suspended.

DISPLACED PERSONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4567) to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I now yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN].

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, as every Member of the Senate knows, the suggested cut-off date for the registration of displaced persons in the several bills which are before us, is January 1, 1949. Earlier in the day I sent to the desk, in order that it might be printed and lie on the table, an amendment which would change the cut-off date from January 1, 1949, to April 21, 1947.

Mr. President, the cut-off date in the present displaced persons law is December 22, 1945, which, as all of us know, represents a date some 7 months after the fighting war was over in Europe, and is the very same cut-off date which was used in the administration of the Presidential directive. The cut-off date of April 21, 1947, which I am advocating in my amendment, is the very same date which was advocated on the floor of the Senate by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the former Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. McGrath, who is presently the distinguished Attorney General of the United States, and by many other Senators when the prevailing law on the subject of displaced persons was being debated at considerable length on the floor of the United States Senate. This is the same date, sir, which was contained in the Administration displaced persons bill which was proposed in the Senate by the former Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. McGrath, and the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] in the bill S. 311.

Mr. President, until the committee bill was reported to the floor of the Senate, and until the substitute for the committee bill was reported to the floor of the Senate, I know of no Member of this body who was advocating a cut-off date later than April 21, 1947.

I wish to impress upon the Senate the definite relationship between the cut-off date in our displaced-persons legislation and the security risk to the Nation. Rather than to make assertions on the

basis of what I consider to be my own considered knowledge of the subject, I would rather invite the attention of the Senate to excerpts from the testimony which was given before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary by intelligence officers of our Federal Government, immigration officials, and others who have had first-hand knowledge of the situation abroad in recent years.

First, let me quote from the testimony given in January of this year by a witness who was formerly a director of certain phases of Army intelligence work in Germany, and who has an intimate knowledge of security problems in connection with displaced persons. I take him to be a reliable witness and an important member of our Defense and Military Establishment. I quote from his testimony the following:

We became convinced with adequate evidence that deliberate attempts were being made by the Soviet Government, by the Polish Government, not only to infiltrate the military installations of Berlin and Germany, but to send people much farther, to the United States, to South America, and to Canada, under the guise of being displaced persons or being political refugees.

Question. Colonel, may I ask you this question? Inviting your attention specifically to the date December 22, 1945, how did the flow of these penetration agents come in volume after that approximate time compared to before?

The WITNESS. I can answer that quickly. It was definitely on the rise on that date because I returned to the United States in the following February of 1946 for a rather extended leave of absence to which all officers were entitled and was recalled because of the heavy increase in attempted penetration of American installations and because certain things had been discovered in the displaced-persons camps in Berlin which needed immediate attention and correction.

Question. To what extent is there present infiltration of Communists as from the east to the west?

The WITNESS. That is a matter I cannot answer except to say it is still of considerable volume.

Question. May I make an observation and ask for your appraisal on the basis of knowledge of the situation from the standpoint of penetration of agents? Under the existing law we have a cut-off date for eligibility of displaced persons. That cut-off date is December 22, 1945, the date prior to which displaced persons must have been in the occupied areas in order to gain eligibility under the law. Do you have any appraisal on the basis of your experience from the standpoint of security as to what would be the probable result if that cut-off date were advanced nearer to the present day?

The WITNESS. I should like to say I know nothing about immigration laws but I do know that since the date you mentioned, December 22, 1945, and the present date there has elapsed a good many years in which time a lot of people have come from behind the iron curtain who definitely are agents of communism and these people are, despite our contempt for them, intelligent, clever and fanatic in their belief in communism. There would be no doubt in my mind that as many as possible of such people would attempt to be admitted to the United States under the liberalized laws.

Question. Would there be a greater or lesser security risk to this country if the eligibility date were advanced?

The WITNESS. There would be a far greater risk because in the intervening years many of those people have established themselves in western Germany, have built up friendships

with Americans, which is part of their jobs, and have pretty well established themselves. Undoubtedly it would be impossible to check their antecedents prior to their coming over the border.

If we limit it to December 1945, it makes our work much easier at the moment. If we set it a year ahead, it makes it that much tougher. If we set it 5 years ahead, it makes it five times as tough, maybe 50 times as tough because hundreds and hundreds of thousands have come in since then.

Mr. President, now let me quote from the testimony given on February 15 of this year by Mr. Almanza Tripp, who is the officer in charge of the immigration detail stationed in Europe to examine displaced persons:

Question. Now, May I ask you this: the present law provides a cut-off date of December 22, 1945, for eligibility in the general category of displaced persons, does it not?

Mr. TRIPP. It does.

Question. In your opinion, would the security risk to the United States of America be greater or less if that cut-off date were advanced closer to the present day?

Mr. TRIPP. Well, obviously, by extending the date, or making it possible for persons who live behind the iron curtain to go to the United States in comparatively large numbers—if a large number of persons who lived under Communist domination are permitted to come here—it would seem to follow that there would be an increase in the security risk.

Question. Now, may I ask you this question on that same point:

On the basis of your observation and experience and information, would you say that the infiltration of Communist agents, the penetration of Communist agents, was greater or less after December 22, 1945?

Mr. TRIPP. There is no way for me to know whether it was greater or less, but there was a much greater opportunity for infiltration.

Question. Do you mean after December 22, 1945?

Mr. TRIPP. That is right.

Here is the testimony, Mr. President, of Mr. Louis G. Craig, given on February 16 of this year to the committee. Mr. Craig is a selector for the Displaced Persons Commission in Germany.

Question. Mr. Craig, the present law provides a cut-off date of December 22, 1945. In your opinion, on the basis of your experience as an employee of the Displaced Persons Commission, if that cut-off date were advanced, would the security risk to this Government and to the people of the United States be increased or decreased?

Mr. CRAIG. I would have to reply to that that the security risk would be increased because of the vast number of individuals coming in from behind the iron curtain into Germany and into Austria.

Finally, Mr. President, here is the testimony given on February 15, 1950, by Frank Benjamin Vaughan, Jr., of the Displaced Persons Commission in Germany:

Question. Mr. Vaughan, I would like to ask you at this time the same question I asked Mr. Tripp earlier today. The present law, as you know, provides a cut-off date of December 22, 1945, for eligibility. If that cut-off date were advanced, would the security risk to the United States Government be greater or less?

Mr. VAUGHAN. It would be greater.

Question. You are saying that on the basis of your observations and experience as an employee of the Displaced Persons Commission?

Mr. VAUGHAN. Yes.

Question. If the investigating process were made more completely and more detailed, would it be more hazardous?

Mr. VAUGHAN. Still the same problem would be there. The difficulty of obtaining information on these people before the date of entry would still exist.

Mr. President, I think it unlikely that the Senate will care to ignore that testimony of those intelligence officers, immigration officials, and officials of the Displaced Persons Commission, with reference to perhaps the most vital of all the bills which are pending in the Senate.

Mr. President, observe, if you will, that the cut-off date which is contained in my amendment is 1 year and 4 months later than the cut-off date contained in the present law. In my opinion, the only justification for extending the cut-off date as far as April 21, 1947, is because it was upon that date that the displaced-persons camps were closed to new arrivals, except in extreme hardship cases, and, further, because by April 21, 1947, there had been a complete registration of all displaced persons. In fact, Mr. President, so far as I know, not a single so-called displaced person has ever been registered in Austria, in Italy, or in Germany since April 21, 1947. Yet we are being requested to countenance and approve a cut-off date of January 1, 1949, which covers a vacuum period of approximately 1 year and 8 months during which no one was either registered in or permitted to enter a displaced-persons camp on the other side of the water.

Mr. President, let me warn the Senate or perhaps "warn" is not the correct word; let me say, instead, that I wish to direct the attention of the Senate to the fact that if the cut-off date is extended beyond April 21, 1947, we shall not only be jeopardizing unnecessarily—at least, I feel this very deeply—the security of our Nation, but we shall be setting a precedent which inevitably will result in the inundation of this country by a flood of aliens, because already there is on foot a movement to extend the cut-off date from January 1, 1949, to January 1, 1950.

Mr. President, where are we going to stop? When are we going to draw the line? Our displaced-persons legislation was initially conceived to afford relief to those persons who had been displaced by the war or shortly thereafter. However, today, some 5 years after the war has been concluded, at least in its fighting sense, the occupied areas are being infiltrated at the rate of approximately 10,000 persons a day. I say quite candidly, Mr. President, that by extending the cut-off date to January 1, 1949, we will be abandoning our principle of embracing persons who were displaced persons as a result of the war, and will start on a road which will eventually embrace tens of millions of peoples who are storming our portals for admission. We will, in addition, be flying in the face of the warnings of those who are engaged in the day-by-day operation of our displaced-persons program, and will be further opening the door to the infiltration of those who would destroy us.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I should like to remind myself and other Senators

of the very splendid presentation made this morning by the senior Senator from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH). In that presentation the Senator from New Jersey said, in substance, "I want first to advise the Senate what the Senate's objective was when we originally passed the displaced persons legislation." He said the objective was both clear and very simple, that what we sought to provide was a refuge, a haven, with care and attention for approximately 1,000,000 people who were left in Europe as displaced persons in 1945 at the end of the war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Washington has expired.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I yield one more minute to the Senator, in which to conclude.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized for one more minute.

Mr. CAIN. I appreciate the kindness of the Senator from Nevada. In the additional minute allotted to me, I should merely like to say that the Senator from New Jersey this morning agreed with me, or at least I think the record made by him will give evidence of my own feeling, that it is simply impossible to reconcile the definition of our objective, namely, to provide care for those displaced persons who had been injured as a result of enemy action in the last war with the recommended cut-off date of January 1, 1949, which obviously would cover a number of people who were not living in Austria, Germany, or Italy, or even present in those countries, during the war, or for several years thereafter. I would only urge my colleagues to consider the advisability of selecting for the cut-off a date beyond which no individual was permitted to enter a displaced persons camp or to register as a displaced person.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I yield 45 minutes to the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. LANGER), and I have an understanding with the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. KILGORE), although he is not presently on the floor, that he will yield 15 minutes to the Senator, giving him 1 hour.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, as acting minority leader, I have been informed that the Senator from West Virginia intended to yield 15 minutes to the Senator from North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized for 1 hour.

DELIVERED - PRICE SYSTEMS AND FREIGHT - ABSORPTION PRACTICES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, coming to the matter of the basing-point legislation, it happened that when the bill was before our committee I alone disagreed with the other 12 members of the committee. At that time I prepared and filed minority views. Those views have been carefully considered by other Members, and I am delighted that Senators on the other side of the aisle have taken up the battle to prevent the bill, as reported, from becoming the law of the land. Already, Mr. President, numerous amendments have been adopted

in conference, with the result that, because of the fact that I filed minority views, at least some good has been accomplished for the common people. However, the bill, as reported, is still unsatisfactory. It is not a bill which appeals to me. If the conference report is adopted, it will not be a bill that appeals to me as being in the best interest of the common people of the United States.

Mr. President, when the farmers in North Dakota tried to free themselves from the yoke imposed upon them by the eastern moneyed interests, they always found themselves opposed at every step of the way by some kind of inspired propaganda campaign. I saw many of those campaigns in the days when we tried to obtain cheaper insurance and interest rates for our crops and our money. But I do not think I have ever seen the kind of bald-faced, absolutely shameless campaign of deceit, misrepresentation, and falsification, that all of us have witnessed in connection with the bill, S. 1008.

If the consequences of the adoption of the conference report were not so serious, I could point out how ludicrous this propaganda campaign has become. Those who have tried to ram this bill down our throats have made so many, so varied, and so farfetched predictions as to what the dire results would be if we did not adopt it, they have not noticed that they even contradicted each other. All along we have seen a parade of masqueraded characters, telling us "I'm a small-business man, this bill is essential to my survival." Or, "I'm a union man, my union will be ruined, unless you pass this measure." Or, "I'm a college professor, and my study of economics tells me that without this bill, we will have local monopolies, and all industry will have to move to Pittsburgh." But when we looked under their masks, and took off their false beards, the voices were those of the big corporations in the steel and cement industries. That is who they were, that is who they are. Behind some of the other characters lurked the voices of the railroads who have all this time fattened on the enforced rail shipment under the basing-point system. For instance, one unsuspecting wheat miller said, well, he had never heard of the basing-point system, and he was not particularly concerned about freight absorption, but the Association of American Railroads had suggested he testify because he liked to keep his m. i. t. rates, would he not?

Why all the masquerading? Is it because the presidents of the steel and cement companies know full well that if they appear to come out for this bill too openly, many people will sit up and take notice, and wonder whether it is not going to cost them money? "Since when do the presidents of billion-dollar corporations express such heartfelt concern for the welfare of small business?" they will wonder. So the steel and cement masters figured it would be much better to send the small-business men themselves. They cannot very well refuse to make the trip, because they pretty much depend on regular supplies of steel and cement. They must have them. And

steel and cement have been hard to obtain for some time. Furthermore, it also looks much better if a local small-business man says he fears local monopoly will develop. After all, there are quite a few persons who might think it would be quite incongruous for such a big monopoly as United States Steel to be concerned that little ones might grow up in its own image.

Characteristic of the bland disregard of logic and consistently which the proponents of this measure have displayed is the double talk about the geographic dislocations which the bill would cause. According to their statements just about every plant and industry in the United States would have to tear down, pack up, and move somewhere else. Here is what the propagandists told the workers in Pittsburgh: "If this bill fails to pass, yours will become a ghost town; all your factories will have to close down because we will no longer be able to compete everywhere."

Watch this one closely, because it is really a very neat sleight of hand. Here is what they told the people in New England, the South and the West: "If you want to continue to make things from steel or use cement for construction, unless this bill passes you will all have to move to Pittsburgh." Of course, if all these predictions were true simultaneously, we should find all the steel fabricators converging on Pittsburgh and find there nothing but a ghost town, because the steel industry would have moved to where the fabricators came from and would there have established themselves little local monopolies.

What a sham. How naive do these propagandists think the people are?

But that is not all. This campaign has also brought forth two of the strangest organizations which ever graced the file clerk's list of lobby registrations—although reluctantly. The first one of these by right of independent birth was the National Competition Committee. This group tried to be a full-fledged Nation-wide grass-roots movement from the day it was conceived out of the clandestine union of steel and cement in Pittsburgh. It rotted on the vine when exposed to the light of a bit of publicity. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch revealed its tie-up with a Pittsburgh public-relations firm, Ketchum, Inc., to which it paid a retainer, the stately sum of \$11,000 a month, not including expenses. Since when, Mr. President, has it become necessary to pay \$11,000 a month to a lobbyist in order to get a bill passed in the United States Senate?

According to the contract, Ketchum was to stir up the people of the grass roots so that they would wander up to Washington to demand the clarification of the businessman's natural right to absorb freight. Eight chapters had sprung up in Dallas, Tulsa, Dayton, Cincinnati, Houston, Cleveland, and, of course, Pittsburgh. But apparently Ketchum, Inc., felt that the publicity they received as a result of their grass-root-planting activities might embarrass some of their reputable clients and let go of the lucrative retainer of \$11,000 a month.

The second of these organizations, the so-called Council for the Clarification of Pricing Practices, had a longer and in some respects even more interesting history. In one sense, this group resembles the creature of this very body. But take a look down the list of the members of this group and see whether they do not sound familiar. Especially note the name of the registrant, the member of a law firm which receives \$1,500 a month from its clients. A paltry sum, to be sure, when compared to the munificent compensation of Ketchum, Inc. There is a reason that the names of the Council for the Clarification of Pricing Practices sound so familiar. They are merely the same people whom we earlier found as members of the Capehart committee's advisory committee of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Here is a list of the 13 members of the council, according to the Congressional Quarterly:

Walter L. Couse, president, Walter L. Couse & Co., Detroit, construction contractor.

Roy C. Ingersoll, Ingersoll Steel & Disk Division, Borg-Warner Corp., Chicago.

Charles W. Everett, Downing Box Co., Milwaukee.

James R. McCarthy, dean, College of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, University of Notre Dame, Indiana.

Nathaniel H. Engle, director, College of Economics and Business, University of Washington, Seattle.

William Schoenberg, president, United Cement, Lime, and Gypsum Workers International Union, AFL.

Also two former presidents of the United States Chamber of Commerce:

Earl O. Shreve and Albert W. Hawkes, formerly a Senator from New Jersey.

Frank A. Kemp, president, Great Western Sugar Co., Denver.

Roland Rodman, Anderson-Prichard Oil Co., Oklahoma City.

Frederick A. Virkus, chairman, Conference of American Small Business Organizations.

H. W. Fraser, president, Order of Railway Conductors of America, independent.

Lee W. Minton, president, Glass Bottle Blowers Association of the United States and Canada, AFL.

The first five men on this list had been members also of the Capehart advisory committee. Probably their activities varied little from one organization to the next. Senator Hawkes, now a member of this group, had been a member of the original Capehart committee when he was in the Senate.

Look at these names again, closely. Two of these men are college professors. I wonder whether it occurs to other Senators to raise the question, Since when college salaries have advanced sufficiently to permit teachers to contribute any sizable part of the \$1,500-a-month retainer to Simon? Is this perhaps merely another instance of figure-heads, letterheads, and masquerade?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I understood the Senator to mention the name "Simon." Was the Senator speaking of Mr. William Simon?

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. LONG. What connection did he have with the Committee for Clarification of the Antitrust Laws?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I regret that I cannot yield any further, because of the limitation of time.

At least now that these 13 men have joined this group, they have shed the mantle of impartiality which covered them while they were members of the Capehart committee's advisory committee.

So that Senators may know what a pernicious system these masquerading lobbyists are trying to perpetuate, let me tell you the story of what happened in my neighboring State of South Dakota.

I am from North Dakota. The State of South Dakota joins North Dakota, so that we in North Dakota are pretty familiar with what takes place in our neighboring State. The people of South Dakota believe in private enterprise just as firmly as do the people in the other States of this country. My two colleagues from that State would no more vote for socialism in this Nation than would the South Dakota delegation in the other body. Yet in 1919 the South Dakota Legislature voted to go into the cement business. This body of American citizens authorized the establishment of a State Cement Commission with power to construct and operate a cement plant within the State. The people of South Dakota took that action, because they thought it would help the development of their State by providing cheaper cement for the building of their highways and public buildings and for private city and farm construction. They had plenty of good raw materials close at hand. They were tired of being at the mercy of the eastern cement trust. No other cement plant existed in South Dakota at that time. One mill had operated long and successfully at Yankton, but a member of the trust had bought it. What did they do with it? They closed it down.

The people of South Dakota wanted a local source of cement which would sell this basic commodity to them at reasonable prices and supply it in adequate quantities. The nearest cement mill to South Dakota at that time was 175 miles away, and transportation costs for this distance bulked heavily in the price South Dakotans had to pay for cement.

The story of what the cement trust did to harass the people of my neighboring State and to obstruct their attempts to obtain for themselves a source of cement is typical. It is typical of the treatment we have received every time we have wanted something without first begging on our knees for it from the eastern managers. It is typical of the treatment which we have long experienced in our part of the country and in the South at the hands of all eastern-controlled trusts. We have felt this oppression from the railroads, the

power and utility interests, and all the other financial bigwigs in Wall Street.

Imagine their consternation at the action of the people of South Dakota: "They are going to build their own cement plant. They will no longer permit us to control their prices and production."

So they went to work and figured out what to do about it. What did they decide? Very simple. They tried to put the plant out of business. First, they established a punitive basing point at Rapid City, where the plant was located. That action meant that cement manufacturers—and the closest plants were located in Iowa, Missouri, and Minnesota—quoted delivered prices at Rapid City much lower than the sum of the base prices at their own plants plus freight costs. It also meant that the management of the South Dakota plant had no choice in setting its own price, and thus lost the competitive advantage of proximity to the local market. As the plant's manager explained to the Federal Trade Commission:

We have had very little choice in the naming or making of a mill base-price. Our competitors shortly after this mill started operation in the early part of 1923, put out quotations to the cement trade, quoting our base as \$1.70 per barrel. This price we felt forced to accept.

In other words, the monopolists tried to put the State plant out of business.

In spite of this outside oppression, the plant continued in operation. Its costs were low, and the people of the State liked to patronize their own mill. The Cement Trust did not like that, of course. They decided more drastic action was called for. In 1929 they reduced the price in the Rapid City plant's territory by 20 cents a barrel. According to a Federal Trade Commission report, it is highly unusual that outside mills thus make the prices within the territory of another cement plant. But this was not a usual situation. That the South Dakota State cement plant deserved special treatment by the Cement Trust was again illustrated in 1930. In that year the cement companies decided to raise their prices 25 cents a barrel. They made one exception, however. They did not raise the price for the Rapid City basing point. By leaving the South Dakota price undisturbed at the lower level they continued their attempts to drive this plant out of business. In spite of these methods, the plant continued in operation.

Since the price-cutting maneuver did not prove successful, members of the trust also tried to persuade the management of the South Dakota plant to come in and join the club. They desperately wanted them to behave and adhere to the basing-point system. That, too, proved not an easy job, because of the determination of the State officials. As one cement manager wrote to another about the difficulties he encountered in this effort:

Warner (a cement-company executive) further said that the industry as a whole hesitates to take this matter up with the South Dakota officials because their experience in the past has been that the Govern-

nor of South Dakota broadcasts anything that is told to the officials of the cement plant and makes the statement that the Cement Trust are trying to control their mill.

Thus by stealth and continued dumping of cheap cement into the territory of the South Dakota plant the cement interests of the East tried to take their toll from the builders and farmers of my neighboring State. What they actually tried to do, of course, was not to sell cement cheaply but, on the contrary, to force the South Dakota plant to come into the exclusive club and adhere to the rules of the game. They wanted them to play along with the basing-point system and adhere to the prices which were set at much higher levels by the other cement producers. The manager of Lehigh Portland Cement Co.'s Mason City, Iowa, plant, which was the closest cement producer to South Dakota, testified to the partial success of his attempts to force the State plant to come up to the trust-made prices. He said in the Federal Trade Commission's investigation of the cement basing-point system:

As time went on we found that the secret-price concessions gradually began to clear up and we did begin to get a considerable volume of business at our published prices.

The entire behavior of the Cement Trust members in using the club of the basing-point system in retaliation to the attempt of the people of South Dakota to supply their own cement, led the Federal Trade Commission to conclude in its 1932 study of cement basing-point pricing:

It is difficult to draw any other conclusion from this situation than that in these practices there was a purpose to injure in the public eye or to crush entirely a State-owned and State-operated cement plant.

In order to understand what we are trying to do in North Dakota, it is important to visualize what happens when these same destructive techniques are used by the Cement Trust against privately owned independent cement plants. These private mills would not have the paramount purpose of selling cement cheaply to the farmers, contractors, and road builders. They are in business to make money. How long could they withstand the onslaught of the organized Cement Trust with its huge financial resources? Or, how long would they want to retain their independence to sell at prices they set themselves?

First, the Cement Trust, as in the South Dakota case, would establish a punitive basing point at the private plant, and would thus deprive it of its geographic advantage both in its relation to supply of raw materials and the proximity to its market. If the plant's cost were cheap enough to permit it to continue in business even at the low price, the trust would cut prices further to the point where the private mill could no longer afford to remain in business. Remember the unequal match in this battle. The independent plant has only the limited resources of its owners. Its antagonist, however, can well afford a few losses in

one location. Profits at his other mills, plus his enormous financial staying power, permit him to carry on the fight until the independent has been forced out of business, or until he gives up the fight and agrees to abide by the trust-made basing-point system. The purpose of this procedure is to insure that no cement plant will quote prices lower than the high prices set by the eastern corporations, that no plant will give secret discounts from published prices, and thus offer real competition to the elaborately cartelized cement market. The vice president of the Lehigh Cement Corp., in hearings before the FTC, was asked the question:

Then what happened, by quoting your prices from a base at the mills of your competitors, what was accomplished?

His answer was:

After that happened there was a gradual change in the situation. . . . Prior to that action competitors were able to make prices in certain territories secretly . . . but with our quotations made publicly those competitors very quickly found that they could no longer get business at varying prices, but must take the price covered by our published quotations.

As time went on we found that the secret price concessions gradually began to clear up and we did begin to get a considerable volume of business at our published prices.

That is the testimony of the vice president of the Lehigh Cement Corp. That is a case history of a number of instances in which a cement producer started out as an independent to serve the people of his area at lower prices made possible by sound economic location with respect to his raw materials. By the destructive tactics of the cement trust he is forced into line. He has no choice but to quote the high cement prices decreed by the cartel and to refrain from passing along to his customers the economies which his location would permit.

Is it any wonder that the people of North Dakota, the farmers, the contractors, and those who would like to further construction of all kinds in my State, have taken matters into their own hands? Is it any wonder that they have decided that the only way in which they can assure for themselves a reasonably priced ample supply of cement, is through construction of our own, State-owned cement plant? The tactics used by the cement trust in oppressing any privately owned independent in the industry leave us no choice. If that is socialism, it is socialism strictly made by the cartels and monopolists themselves.

I might add at this point that the South Dakota plant, out of its earnings, has not only retired its bonds, but is now paying money into the State treasury.

After this look at the history of the South Dakota plant, we can only wonder, What is in store for the people of my State?

In the same year, 1919, in which South Dakota authorized the initial step in the construction of its cement plant, the people of North Dakota amended their constitution to permit authorization of a \$5,000,000 bond issue for the same purpose. Until last year, however, the legislature has never enacted legislation to begin construction of the plant.

In 1949, under the same impulse which prompted the South Dakota management to project a doubling of their plant's capacity, Republican legislative leaders in North Dakota suddenly made an about-face. They had opposed the authority for the plant. But last year four Republican State leaders jointly introduced a measure in the first days of the legislative session to provide \$25,000 for a survey of the feasibility of erecting a cement plant in our State and for a referendum on the bond issue. They were willing to leave it to the people, to the taxpayers, on a referendum.

Let me quote from a report in the *Bismarck Capital* of January 14, 1949, which attempts to explain why my Republican friends suddenly thought North Dakota would benefit from construction of its own cement plant:

The ROC leaders, senators Morgan, Flatt, Braun, and Bridston, explained their change of heart as the result of the new Federal regulation, eliminating the base-point system of pricing * * * with the construction of a plant within the State it is estimated that within a few years the cost would be saved in freight charges alone.

Those four Republican leaders are four reactionaries, Mr. President. Not by the greatest stretch of the imagination would the citizens of North Dakota believe that the four are liberal in any way, shape, or manner.

I agree with my Republican friends in their reported analysis of the importance of the basing-point system. All these years we have had to be satisfied with the cement that producers outside our State condescended to let us have, and at the price they chose to fix for us. As a result, while in 1948 South Dakota ranked eighth among the States in per capita consumption of cement, North Dakota ranked twenty-second. South Dakota had 354 miles of concrete highways, North Dakota only 70. The average maintenance costs of these roads in South Dakota amounted to only \$48.13 in that year compared with a national average of \$109.84. For North Dakota these maintenance costs in 1949 amounted to the staggering average of \$553.50. That is 5 times the national average for 1948, and 10 times the cost of South Dakota.

All during the war, when cement was generally in pretty tight supply, South Dakota had plenty to fill her needs. But North Dakota had very little.

I should like to quote from an editorial in the *Berthold (N. Dak.) Tribune* for January 20, 1949, to illustrate the effects which the dearth of cement has had on construction in my State:

The proposition to build a State-owned cement plant has been brought up again at this session of the State legislature, this time by a bill introduced by ROC members. As this project has been favored in the past by the NPL, maybe it can be put across this session.

This is a measure that seems to meet with general approval.

I may say that the State of North Dakota is not composed of radical citizens. In World War I the State of North Dakota led every other State in the Union in the per capita purchase of Liberty bonds. In World War II, North

Dakota again led the Nation 3 to 1 in the per capita purchase of war bonds. But I say, Mr. President, when private industry does not take care of what it is supposed to take care of, then it is the duty of the Government to step in and to protect the people.

The editorial continues:

The shortage of cement is holding up the construction of many buildings in the State, particularly where the contractor is not a "big shot" with a "pull," and many a job in small towns and on farms is held up for lack of cement.

Every year thousands of bushels of grain are destroyed in old wooden elevator fires and these elevators would be replaced with fire-proof concrete structures if cement were readily available.

As this editorial points out, all groups in the State have suffered from the lack of cement. But it has hit farmers especially hard.

Two months later, on March 6, the *Fargo Forum* carried a report indicating that the supply situation had not improved, and that the outlook was dark. Let me quote the first few paragraphs:

Cement supply no better. And may be less, this year.

The cement supply situation, serious last year, is going to be no better, if as good this year.

That's the word from the Fargo-Moorhead contractors and building suppliers, as they approach the 1949 construction season. Huge demands last year made it impossible to supply all the wants and the result was that cement mills put all areas on an allocation basis.

Fargo-Moorhead handlers have been informed that last year's allotments probably will be continued, but what develops in the way of highway and industrial construction is going to determine largely how much will be available for other types of buildings—homes, for instance.

Users who have contracts or definite understanding with local distributors will be in the best position to obtain cement, but there is no guaranty that all orders will be filled, the dealers said.

Shortage of cement was what held up the Island Park area paving project until late last fall, with the result that only a small portion of the paving was laid.

John B. Jardine, of the Concrete Sectional Culvert Co., said some cement companies had already allocated all their cement for the year—

Mind you, Mr. President, this was on March 6—

and users have been put on limited supply. Other companies are supplying cement on a month-to-month basis.

"I have not found that there will be any more cement than last year and apparently the only relief would come in lesser demand," Jardine said.

Of course, lesser demand would be a cure. Shall we permit the Cement Trust to tell us that we shall not have new highways, new buildings in our cities and on our farms, that we shall continue to lose grain through fires in old wooden elevators, that we shall not replace washed-out bridges but drive our cars right through the rivers, the way our forefathers drove their teams through them before bridges had ever been built?

In addition to the extreme shortage, of course, there is also the factor of price. We in North Dakota are now paying almost \$1 more per barrel for cement

than the people of South Dakota are paying. I particularly want my distinguished friend, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], who has been with us and done good work in leading the fight, to know that in North Dakota we are paying almost \$1 more per barrel for cement than the people of South Dakota are paying. That is by reason of the fact that the people of South Dakota have their own State cement plant. Of course, whenever anyone advocates the State going into business, he is promptly charged with being a Socialist.

To meet the needs of our State and county roads, we would have to spend \$25,000,000 a year, plus annual outlays of almost \$7,000,000 for maintenance. The total expenditure required over a 10-year period would be more than \$300,000,000. With costs of this size, it is obvious that any lowering in the price of cement would constitute a sizable saving for the taxpayers of North Dakota. On the basis of prices paid for cement during 1949 by contractors on Federal-aid-to-highway projects, the people of North Dakota could save \$100,000 a year at South Dakota prices if they undertook to bring their roads up to the estimated level of requirements. That saving would be on roads alone—it would not include additional possible savings on miscellaneous construction projects where every time a contractor or farmer pays out over \$4 for a barrel of cement, he knows that in South Dakota, he would have to pay closer to \$3.

All these years, Mr. President, the people of North Dakota have been the victims of the basing-point system. All these years North Dakota has been an unsafe place for a locally owned cement plant. It has been unsafe, because, as the experience of our neighbors to the south has shown, we, too, would have felt the full onslaught of the entrenched Cement Trust. This trust would have put any small private plant out of business through punitive bases, through dumping, or it would have forced such a plant into their price-fixing scheme.

Apparently the realization of the new freedom from predatory price discrimination which the Supreme Court has granted us with the Cement decision, came to some of the Republican leaders of North Dakota before it has come to some of my colleagues here in the Senate. They saw that with the basing-point system thrown into the ashcan, where it properly belongs, we could now have a cement plant in North Dakota. However, here in Washington some of my colleagues, including some of the members of the other party, because they are somewhat removed from the everyday problems back home, are still trying to tell us that enactment of this bill is necessary to dispel this synthetic confusion that its supporters have fabricated.

Of course, Mr. President, we have not finally enacted our State bill, either. Both houses of our legislature passed it by overwhelming votes, but Governor Aandahl has vetoed it. Nevertheless, the people of North Dakota still want their cement plant. They are going to have an initiative in November; and I have

no doubt that they will approve the project, because they realize that the hazards of a private plant are so great as to make it entirely too insecure a proposition.

Mr. President, I want every Senator to realize that by our vote on this bill, we shall determine whether we shall return to the Cement Trust the club with which to bludgeon the local plant into submission to trust policies. By our vote, we shall decide whether the as-yet-unborn cement plant of the people of North Dakota shall have a fair chance to survive and to fill their desperate needs for this basic building material. For all these years the Cement Trust has saddled us with high prices, and consequently has denied the people the cement they have needed and wanted. For all these years the threat of reprisal by means of the basing-point club has scared us from taking the necessary steps to help ourselves.

The basing-point system has long been with us, ever since the turn of the century, as a matter of fact, when United States Steel was first put together into the beginnings of its present giant form. It is such an ingenious and complex scheme, although so simple in its actual operation, that few students of economics have been able to explore all its vicissitudes and ill results. Out in my part of the country we have always known that the economic odds were against us, but it took the Government lawyers in Washington some time to pull together the evidence and prove their case so that it would stand up in court. In 1924 the Federal Trade Commission caught on to the single-basing-point system, the old Pittsburgh plus, as it was then called, and said to the steel industry that it should stop it. Reluctantly, but hastily, United States Steel shifted to a multiple-basing-point system, little less deleterious, but apparently, for the time being, at least, legal.

The next attack on the system came with the findings of the Temporary National Economic Committee. The committee's final report condemned the system in no uncertain terms, and recommended that it be abolished through legislation. Since that proposal did not carry statutory weight, industry was only mildly perturbed.

The trusts began to take more serious notice, however, when, during the middle forties, the Federal Trade Commission began its serious onslaught on basing points in one industry after another, first in the glucose and corn-products cases, and then in the now famous Cement case. In each instance the Supreme Court upheld the Federal Trade Commission's case. Industry reaction did not become voluble and violent until the Supreme Court outlawed the multiple basing point on April 26, 1948, because it agreed with the FTC that the cement manufacturers had conspired to fix prices. This came too close for comfort to the heart of the steel citadel. Not only did this decision forbode what might be in store for the basing-point system in steel, which the Federal Trade Commission had even then under investigation, but it already involved United States Steel through its subsidiary, Universal

Atlas Cement, the largest cement producer in the world.

Reactions came promptly, and continued in an unending stream. In an interview on the very next day after the cement decision, Mr. Irving S. Olds, chairman of the board of United States Steel—as reported in the New York Journal of Commerce of April 28—declared that industry now faced two alternatives, either to seek remedial legislation or to educate the Supreme Court. Just think of the brazenness of that statement, Mr. President.

Two points in the strategy to be used by United States Steel and its colleagues became clear quite quickly. First, it obviously decided to take the approach of seeking remedial legislation, apparently deemed a simpler method than the education of the Supreme Court. Second, it decided to carry on a behind-the-scenes campaign and let others speak its piece for it. This campaign took several forms. They all had one purpose, however, and that was to broaden the support for legislation to set aside the Supreme Court's decision in the Cement case. Yet all through the shenanigans that followed, the big steel corporations remained discreetly in the background, and never once acknowledged their intimate connection with the strange school of fish which they themselves had spawned, which swarmed up the Potomac to Washington.

Presumably, they realized that the people might be a bit suspicious of any proposal the steel trust supported, because not infrequently in the past the interests of Big Steel and those of the people were somewhat at odds with each other.

So instead of besieging Washington themselves, they sent forth a legion of small-business men, labor representatives, and general citizens to bewail the Supreme Court's decision in the Cement case, and to call for what they euphemistically called clarification of the antitrust laws. Since, at first glance, the Cement decision really appeared quite clear in its effect on the basing-point system—namely, it outlawed it, as used in the cement industry—there immediately appeared a need to find something unclear, so that it could be clarified. So the steel and cement boys put their heads together; and when they came out of the huddle, up came a cloud of fog. They started to blow, and they kept on blowing until they had beclouded the whole issue of the Cement decision to the extent that even the smartest lawyer, if he listened to them, could no longer tell what the Supreme Court had said.

They spread that campaign of misrepresentation to the press, to their customers, to their workers, and to their friends at the chamber of commerce meetings. In fact, I think a little of it may have entered the Halls of Congress.

What happened? The customers of the steel corporations did not have much choice. Steel was hard to get; therefore, when the corporation told them that unless laws were enacted to upset the Cement decision, they could not get steel anymore, the small fabricators became worried. We know what happens when a small-business man becomes worried. He writes, wires, or calls his Congress-

man. They did just that. This is what one steel executive wrote to his customers, for instance, it is a letter from Ben Moreell, president of Jones & Laughlin:

We urge our customers and all others interested in the welfare of the country to give serious consideration to this matter. We believe that all will conclude, as we have, that prompt action by the Congress is essential if we are to continue to have the vigorous competition in this country which has been so fundamental to our national development.

What competition in steel, we might ask?

Mr. E. T. Weir, president of the National Steel Co., wrote a letter to his customers, too. That letter was a month later than the Moreell letter, and there Mr. Weir sounds a great deal more urgent. He told them that the Cement decision would have the effect of localizing steel production and fabrication in a few districts; and he continued—in a slightly breathless fashion, which must have sent his customers hurrying aboard the next plane to Washington—as follows:

There is no time to be lost. The quicker action is taken, the quicker relief can be secured. A great deal of work must be done. Since the type of Congress we had during the 1930's refused to do what the Supreme Court had done, there is every reason to expect that the type of Congress to be elected in November will reverse the Court.

Apparently Mr. Weir thought the Eightieth Congress would be more likely to do his bidding than the Eighty-first, which was yet to be elected. So he wanted action taken within the 2 months following his appeal in September of 1948.

To appeal to their employees, the steel managers used a somewhat different approach. According to testimony by Otis Brubaker, research director of the United Steelworkers, CIO, the propagandists for the basing-point system have extended the propaganda offensive into the mills and factories, as well as in the public press and radio.

I quote further:

Some managements have carried this campaign directly to their employees through their collective-bargaining agencies. A number of our own local unions have received appeals from their employers for support in this controversy. Some few smaller and less experienced locals have acquiesced to these requests either out of respect for their employers or because they have been sold a bill of goods and have joined their companies in fearing the effects of price competition on their particular companies. Most of our locals, however, apprised the union's international officers of these requests or asked if the international had investigated the matter and had taken a position. Some of these management statements to the local unions in their plants have threatened plant shut-downs, lay-offs, and curtailment of operations. Is it any wonder that many local union members have been concerned?

Just in case either or both these appeals should fail, the industry adopted another, more drastic method of arousing feelings against the cement decision. This trick was a good one, and it fooled a multitude of people, and the ones whom it did not fool, did not dare speak

up, because if they did, they might henceforth lose their supply of steel.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LANGER. I wonder if I might have 15 minutes more.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, may I inquire whether, thus far, the time yielded to the Senator from North Dakota by the Senator from Nevada has expired?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota has had 45 minutes yielded him by the Senator from Nevada, 15 by the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. I decline to yield any more time, then, much as I regret not yielding to my friend the Senator from North Dakota.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator declines to yield any further time.

Mr. LANGER. I may say, Mr. President, that is the very thing I feared at the time the unanimous consent was asked. So, the next time unanimous consent is requested, I am going to object. We got caught a little while ago, at the time of the discussion concerning the farm bill.

DISPLACED PERSONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4567) to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield for a unanimous-consent request?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No one can ask anything, unless either the Senator from Nevada or the Senator from West Virginia yields to him.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield for a unanimous-consent request to make an insertion in the RECORD?

Mr. KILGORE. Not unless it is charged against both sides.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield time to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, what is the question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator yield some time to anyone?

Mr. KILGORE. I decline to yield any time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LUCAS. Who is going to speak next?

Mr. KILGORE. I do not know.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, is it impossible to insert any matter in the RECORD?

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Senate recess.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is impossible for the Chair to recognize anyone who desires time, except those to whom one of the two Senators yields. While the Senate is in session, the time is within their control.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, may I request, for the RECORD, a statement of the amount of time charged to each side up to this time?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Up to the present time, the Senator from Nevada has used or yielded 104 minutes; the Senator from West Virginia, 174 minutes.

Mr. KILGORE. I thank the Chair.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President—

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield to the majority leader.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Inasmuch as the two Senators involved under the unanimous-consent agreement control the time when the Senate is in session, it seems to the Chair necessary that any Senator who wants to put anything in the RECORD or say anything or make a motion has to be yielded to by one or the other of the two Senators. It is a rather peculiar situation, but that seems to be the import of the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield to the majority leader for a question or a motion.

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Senate stand in recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois moves that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock tomorrow. It is not a debatable motion. It is not a request for unanimous consent; it is a motion to recess.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I should like to have the majority leader withhold his motion for just a moment. It is only a quarter to five, and I have been asked to act as minority leader in the absence of the minority leader. It merely seems to me the day is still young, or the evening is long, and we have some very important legislation before us. There is the Commodity Credit Corporation bill, and we have been pleading all along that we might have an opportunity to consider it.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would suggest that the time of adjournment today has no relationship to that legislation or any other legislation. The Senate has agreed to vote at 2 o'clock next Wednesday on the pending bill. The unanimous-consent agreement makes it the continuing business until that hour. So that the question as to how long the session will run today would have no effect upon when any other legislation would come before the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, we tried to get a unanimous-consent agreement to vote tomorrow upon the bill the Senator is talking about, and I think it was objected to by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion of the Senator from Illinois is that the Senate recess until 12 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois withhold his motion?

Mr. LUCAS. I withhold the motion.

Mr. KILGORE. I decline to yield any further.

RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 4, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 3 (legislative day of March 29), 1950):

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Frank Pace, Jr., of Arkansas, to be Secretary of the Army.

NATIONAL SECURITY RESOURCES BOARD

W. Stuart Symington, of Missouri, to be Chairman of the National Security Resources Board.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

To be senior surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel), effective date of acceptance:

Hugh B. Cottrell

To be surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance:

James A. Finger
William A. Miller
Sidney Olansky

To be senior assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance:

Robert C. Partenhimer
Alexandra Symonds

To be scientist (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance:

Simon Kinsman

To be senior assistant veterinarians (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance:

Herbert G. Stoenner Lauri Luoto
Ernest S. Tierkel John F. Winn

To be assistant veterinarian (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective date of acceptance:

Harry Rubin

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. Arthur D. Struble, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commander, Seventh Fleet.

Ensign William T. Roos, Supply Corps, United States Navy, for permanent appointment to the grade of ensign in the line.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 3, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we have entered upon Holy Week, commemorating days whose sacred significance our finite minds cannot comprehend. May we contemplate their meaning with a humble spirit and a contrite heart.

We thank Thee for the King, who on Palm Sunday proclaimed His sovereignty over the spirit of man and unto whom we must give our allegiance.

Fill us with gratitude for the great Prophet who, during the succeeding days,

revealed the eternal truth of God. Inspire us with such a love of Thy truth that we shall come to know the truth of Thy love.

We praise Thee for the High Priest who on Good Friday laid upon the altar the acceptable sacrifice of His own life. Help us to understand that "we never choose the better part until we set the cross up in the heart."

Grant that on Easter Sunday we may share the glorious resurrection of our King, our Prophet, our High Priest, rising with Him in newness of life to build that blessed highway where men and nations shall walk together in His spirit.

To Thy name we give all the glory. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 31, 1950, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On March 27, 1950:

H. R. 7207. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes.

On March 31, 1950:

H. J. Res. 398. Joint resolution relating to cotton and peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and to price support for potatoes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 507. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lorraine Malone;

S. 738. An act for the relief of Earl B. Hochwalt; and

S. Con. Res. 48. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House today for 30 minutes following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

[Mr. DOLLINGER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

FRANK PACE, JR.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include certain quotations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay a short tribute to a distinguished young man, a product of my district, Hon. Frank Pace, Jr., who has recently been honored by the President by appointment as Secretary of the Army.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TRIMBLE. I desire to join my colleague in his tribute, because both parents of Frank Pace were born in my district, in the hills of the Ozark country. The State and the Nation are honored by the appointment of Frank Pace, Jr., to the position of Secretary of the Army.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. The gentleman would agree, I am sure, that he will make a great Secretary. He was a great soldier. He was just 6 years old when I was mustered out of the Army after a brief and inconspicuous service in the First World War, and the present Army is a greater Army. As an old soldier I salute him and predict a great career for him in the public service.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DEANE. I join with the gentleman from Arkansas in paying tribute to Mr. Frank Pace, Jr. I have great admiration for him. No young man in Government service has made more progress nor had a greater rise in the Government and he has done a great job.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I too have watched his advancement with pride. Our fathers before us were friends though often antagonists in courtroom battles of western Arkansas.

I know the Members of the House wish him well in his new office. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following excerpts from newspaper articles. Jim Lucas in the Washington Daily News:

Frank Pace, who will be the new Secretary of the Army, is one Arkansas boy who came to Washington to stay.

At 37, with a year as director of a \$40,000,000,000 budget behind him, he's one of the youngest men in top-drawer officialdom. There's nothing he likes better. Frank Pace, who lives at 5024 Macomb Street NW., frankly enjoys it and sees no reason to pretend otherwise. When President Truman moves him up another notch—as he's done several times recently—Mr. Pace is greatly honored and tickled pink. Back in Little Rock, he recalls, other boys used to dream of becoming cowboys or engineers. Frank Pace says he dreamed of working for the Government.

WASHINGTON CURIO

That makes him a Washington curio. The majority of his colleagues look on Federal service as a stepping stone to something better. Most of them place a time limit on their stay here. Frank Pace says he's limited only by his health and the Government's need of him. His health is good. And President Truman apparently thinks he's a mighty handy man to have around. Mr. Pace sometimes talks about the terrific toll a Gov-

ernment job takes on a man, but he says he's not talking about himself.

He says there's a tremendous satisfaction in devoting your life to the public. He's inclined to use such phrases as "democracy at the crossroads," then check himself in embarrassment. But he adds, "I really mean it." A congenial man, the slender 6-footer instinctively likes people and wants others to share his enthusiasm. He thinks more young men and women should follow his lead.

John A. Giles in the Washington Sunday Star:

The new Army Secretary talks rapidly and earnestly and is always saying parenthetically that he must hurry along to get all his facts across and round out his ideas. He has an informal feet-on-the-desk manner and impresses one pretty much as an honest country boy selling some prize eggs at a crossroads store. Two years at fashionable Hill Preparatory School at Pottstown, Pa., four at Princeton, and 3 years at Harvard Law School have left him with no discernible affectation.

One of the most amazing things about Mr. Pace is the inability to find anyone in Government circles who has anything harsh to say about him, to admit that he has any shortcomings. Apparently his willingness to consult fully with them over budget matters and then make a fair and factual presentation to the President even when he disagrees—in sharp contrast to some of the star chamber proceedings at the Bureau in the past—have convinced almost everybody that he's tops.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include a letter written to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. DAGUE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

[Mr. PLUMLEY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PATRIOTS' DAY

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want to express to the Speaker of the House, Mr. RAYBURN, and the House leaders, Mr. McCORMACK and Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts, my appreciation for the passage of House Concurrent Resolution No. 190 by the House of Representatives last Friday.

This resolution gives further official recognition to the observance and celebration of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of Patriots' Day, by the

appointment of a Patriots' Day Celebration Commission to be composed of three Members of the United States Senate and five Members of the House of Representatives.

To the people of Concord and Lexington, in my congressional district, as well as all of our Massachusetts citizenry, Patriots' Day, April 19, has always meant a great deal. For many years it has been celebrated as a holiday in Massachusetts. Every school child has thrilled to the history lessons bearing upon those momentous days of 1775, when the Massachusetts countryside was aroused by the midnight ride of Paul Revere and the farmers and shopkeepers of Concord and Lexington left their daily pursuits to meet the British redcoats and turn them back.

Recognized as the very beginning of our long and successful struggle for independence, it is fitting and significant that a century and three-quarters later Congress should join with the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in commemorating that epochal engagement.

I believe the language used in the report upon the resolution as it came from the Committee on the Judiciary expresses adequately the purpose of this commemoration. The report said:

The resolute spirit of those few who participated in that epochal engagement epitomized the character of generations of Americans who followed after and brought this Nation to its pinnacle of prestige in the modern world. Let us forget how sorely needed is this quality of defiance to tyranny and oppression, we believe it highly desirable that the Commission authorized by the measure have time to formulate adequate plans.

In these present days, so fraught with peril from enemies from within, it is necessary and significant to point to the heroism and selfless patriotism of those citizens turned soldier for a day. Their accomplishments have always been a guide to later defenders of our country and will never be forgotten.

It is also fitting and proper that the United States Marine Band has been authorized by resolution to take part in this observance and celebration.

I want to thank my colleague the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON], the chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, for his gracious interest in this matter, and the gentlemen from Massachusetts [Mr. THOMAS LANE and Mr. ANGLIER GOODWIN] for their efforts. To him and his committee, and to the members of the full Judiciary Committee, the people of Massachusetts owe a vote of thanks.

Following is a copy of the resolution:

Whereas the 19th day of April 1775 witnessed the first military engagement between the American colonists and British troops, and the fighting that then occurred at Concord and Lexington, in Massachusetts, being the prologue to the mighty drama of the Revolution and determined the character of its first campaign; and

Whereas the significance of April 19 in the history of our country is not to be measured by the extent of the military forces that engaged in local battle in 1775, but by the direction and strength of the intangible forces then set in motion which in due course established the United States of America; and

Whereas a frequent recurrence to the events out of which this Nation arose, and a

better understanding of the principles upon which our forefathers grounded their independence cannot fail to stimulate and renew that high sense of patriotism which has ever been the glory of our country; and

Whereas each such dramatic struggle onward in the process of world civilization has been marked by a ceremonial indicating the formal and official conclusion thereof, the first Commander in Chief and General of the Continental Army purposely selected the 19th of April as the date for a peace proclamation which he read to assembled troops on April 19, 1783: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there is hereby established a commission to be known as the Patriots' Day Celebration Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission") and to be composed of eight Commissioners, as follows: Three Members of the Senate to be appointed by the Vice President and five Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The Commissioners shall serve without compensation and shall select a chairman from among their number.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the Commission to prepare and carry out a comprehensive plan for the observance and celebration of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of Patriots' Day for the commemoration of the events that took place on April 19, 1775. In the preparation of such plans, the Commission shall cooperate with the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and its cities and towns in order that there may be proper coordination and correlation of plans for such observance and celebration.

LODGE GOSSETT RESOLUTION

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include certain correspondence and editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year the Washington Post took me severely to task for some comments that I made on intimidation of the press by Judge Kaufman at the first Hiss trial. I responded in a letter, standing my ground, which the Washington Post published in full.

Somewhat more recently, in fact, on March 8, the Washington Post ran an editorial entitled "Minority President," in which they said that "Senator TAFT finds himself in strange company in fighting the Lodge-Gossett resolution." The editorial goes on to make a great to-do about the danger of electing a minority President. I was compelled to enter the lists again by writing the Washington Post, but only after an interchange of letters with the editor did they publish portions of my letter interlarded with their own comments.

I am against the Lodge-Gossett resolution and all its works.

To prove my contention, I might say that under this suggested innovation, Bryan would have been elected President in 1896, whilst McKinley was out away ahead in the popular vote.

I am spreading the above-mentioned correspondence and editorials in the Appendix of the Record, with some additional remarks of my own.

DRIED EGGS

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, this morning I was able to locate a can of dried eggs. It was some job to find those dried eggs in the Washington markets. They are a scarce commodity. I then sent the following wire to the President at Key West:

The PRESIDENT,

Winter White House,

Key West, Fla.:

At long last located can dried eggs. Forwarded it with reminder of 79,000,000 pounds in storage all in danger of spoilage. Recommend having these scrambled. They will be no more scrambled than mess you are tolerating in not taking remedial action to dispose of these wholesome surplus foods.

The total loss to the taxpayers on carrying charges for these perishable-food commodities amounts now to \$3,630,000. How the President can ignore this indefensible waste of the taxpayers' money is beyond my comprehension. But my mail indicates that hundreds of people are learning the facts every day. Once they become sufficiently aroused I am sure he will hear from them in no uncertain terms. And the day of reckoning will surely come.

NATURAL GAS BILL

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, when the Democrat leadership of the House rammed down our throats late Friday night the bill to make big gas bigger at the expense of every natural-gas consumer, we were told that it would not increase gas bills, and I quote the phrase of our distinguished Speaker, "one red penny." I now understand that is true—until after the next election.

It is still not too late to hope that this damage can be undone. Despite rumors to the contrary, it seems inconceivable that the President will sign this measure which will surely rise to haunt him at every whistle stop he makes on his forthcoming political tour. Here in truth and in fact is a bill for the interests and against the people.

I have today wired the President at his sunny retreat urging a veto of this grab by a handful of Democratic campaign contributors. I urge all my colleagues of both parties who share my convictions to join in this crusade to prevent a sell-out of the natural-gas consumers of the land.

NO. 81, SPENDING CONGRESS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. **RICH**. Mr. Speaker, 1 week ago Friday you gave \$2,000,000,000 to the Commodity Credit Corporation to buy the farmers' crops and store them. Last Friday you gave ECA \$3,100,000,000 to give to foreign countries. Where will you get the money? This week we have Good Friday. May we ask all to go to church and ask for divine guidance. We need it badly.

In the meantime, you will consider in this body the greatest appropriation bill ever to come before the Congress for the departments of the Government, \$29,000,000,000. Where will you get the money? Here is where we can get out the ax and cut this appropriation to the bone. Save the overburdened taxpayers and balance the budget. Be wise and economize.

WHITE HOUSE MEMENTOS

Mr. **KEEFE**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. **KEEFE**. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the White House Commission, I speak now in answer to the numerous requests from Members of the Congress for material declared surplus and to be made available for distribution to interested persons throughout the Nation. The Members of Congress within the next two weeks will receive a written questionnaire from the Commission indicating the character and type of material which will be available for distribution. You will have an opportunity to list all of the organizations and individuals that might be interested in receiving a memento from this great historic building.

I am calling this to your attention today for fear that Members may not realize the importance of that communication when it reaches their office.

You may get it during the time that the House is in recess and every Member should instruct his staff to preserve that communication in order that you may participate with your constituents and your great organizations in your district in receiving suitable mementos which will be available as a result of the renovation of the White House.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

Mr. **O'SULLIVAN**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. **O'SULLIVAN**. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today in the House of Representatives a bill patterned after the Convict Made Goods Act, to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of any goods, wares or merchandise manufactured, produced or mined by any person, firm or corporation during the period of time when any such person, firm

or corporation, refuses to bargain collectively, fairly, and in good faith, with its employees, or indulges in any unfair labor practices.

A companion bill will be introduced in the other body.

The need for such legislation becomes quite apparent when one views the conduct of Wilson & Co., meat packers, toward their packing house workers. This company is the sole and only major packing house which has refused to enter into any work contract with the proper accredited union in their plants and by their uncalled-for stubbornness in this regard they have created intense ill will among their employees, which soon may result in a strike and not only to the great damage and injury to this large meat packing concern, but also to its employees as well, and the communities where plants are located, but also to persons marketing livestock for slaughter and marketing other farm products.

It is indeed regrettable that this large business institution which has won such a coveted place for its products in the market places of the world and at the tables of the Nation, should persist in their senseless coal baron-like attitude toward their workers. This law may cause them to stop and ponder over their unwise and un-American course of conduct, and also cause them to resolve to desist in their senseless manner of dealing with labor unions.

HON. STUART SYMINGTON, CHAIRMAN OF NATIONAL SECURITY RESOURCES BOARD

Mr. **BROOKS**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. **BROOKS**. Mr. Speaker, the announcement over the week end indicates that Secretary of Air Stuart Symington is leaving the position of Secretary of Air for the position of chairman of the National Security Resources Board.

Mr. Symington has made an enviable record as head of the Air Force. In his short term the Air Force has thrown off its swaddling clothes, so to speak, and has assumed its proper position in the defense of the Nation. He has shown rare courage and outstanding leadership. The imprint of his personality and his ability will long remain with the Air Force and will remain as a permanent contribution to the defense of our Nation.

Mr. **RANKIN**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **BROOKS**. I yield to my distinguished friend the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. **RANKIN**. If Mr. Symington had been in that position 9 years ago the Pearl Harbor disaster never would have happened.

Mr. **BROOKS**. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. **McCORMACK**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **BROOKS**. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. **McCORMACK**. I agree with everything my friend from Louisiana has said. Stuart Symington is one of the outstanding Americans of this era. We are thankful that he is continuing in public service in the very responsible position that he fills. We all have confidence in the ability, the integrity, and the judgment of this distinguished American, who I am very proud to call a friend of mine.

Mr. **BROOKS**. He has done an outstanding job which the American people will not forget.

Mr. **KEEFE**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **BROOKS**. I yield.

Mr. **KEEFE**. I agree fully in what the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana has said about Stuart Symington. I consider him to be an outstanding public servant. I believe that in the tremendously important job that lies ahead, in his assignment he will render the same distinguished character of service that he has rendered as head of the Air Force of the United States Department of Defense.

Mr. **SIKES**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **BROOKS**. I yield.

Mr. **SIKES**. I concur in all that has been said about Stuart Symington's value as a public servant. In my mind he long has clearly been one of the ablest and soundest men that we have in Government. As Secretary of the Air Force he has done a magnificent job in building the Air Force to its present level of effectiveness, and personally, I dislike to see him leave that all-important task. I realize that his talents are needed in the position where he is going, and I admire his unselfish decision to serve where the President feels he can be of most value to the Nation. I join in wishing him the best of success.

Mr. **MAHON**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **BROOKS**. I yield.

Mr. **MAHON**. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with others in paying tribute to the remarkable record made by Stuart Symington as Secretary of the Air Force. He has done a wonderful job. He has made an incalculable contribution to the security and welfare of this Nation. When I first heard that he was about to take this job as Chairman of the National Security Resources Board I was disappointed. I still regret to see Mr. Symington leave the Air Force but the job to which he is going is of such transcendent importance to the people of the United States and the world I rejoice to see it filled by a man of Mr. Symington's caliber. A real job is overdue by the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board. Stuart Symington, administrator and patriot extraordinary, will get the job done.

The **SPEAKER**. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks] has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. **MITCHELL** asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on Wednesday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

HON. FRANK PACE, JR.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday the President nominated Frank Pace, Jr., of Little Rock, Ark., to the office of Secretary of the Army. Mr. Pace now joins the ranks with such illustrious Arkansans as Augustus H. Garland, Albert Pike, John W. Snyder, Leslie Biffle, John R. Steelman, and many others.

Frank Pace has made a phenomenal climb up the governmental ladder since he first came to Washington as a major with the Air Transport Command. When he retired to inactive duty, he went to work as a special assistant in the Attorney General's office. He lost no time in making known his abilities. In 1946, Postmaster General Hannegan made him his executive assistant. Two years later he stepped into the Bureau of the Budget as assistant to the Director. Mr. Pace was named Director of the Budget on January 7, 1949. He has made an excellent record in the Government and as a young man we can expect many years of outstanding public service from Frank Pace.

Mr. Speaker, our Government has benefited from the noble services of many "Arkansawyers." August H. Garland served as Attorney General in the Cabinet of President Cleveland. Today, with the addition of Frank Pace, Arkansas would have two native sons in the President's inner circle, the other being the Honorable John W. Snyder, Secretary of the Treasury. The distinguished Secretary of the Senate and presidential confidant, Les Biffle, hails from Piggott, Ark., and Dr. John R. Steelman, the Assistant to the President, is another outstanding Arkansan.

There are many prominent Arkansans in important positions of the Federal Government today, but they are too numerous to mention at this time. We are proud of the records made by our fellow Arkansans in the past and the records they are making now. I am most pleased and happy that the President saw fit to nominate Frank Pace to this important position.

Frank Pace has ascended the heights to success through merit and tireless effort. His choice is symbolic of the opportunities enjoyed by Americans under the system of government which recognizes, ability, energy, and perseverance. The President's selection is an inspiration to the American youth.

UNPARTISAN ORGANIZATION ON FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I understand the President wants some sort of an unpartisan instead of a bipartisan organization in foreign policy. He evidently thinks he can find some Republicans to lend their names to his program, take the blame for his failures.

If any Republicans are inclined to go along with that suggestion, I think they ought to look over the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of last Friday.

The Gentleman from Nebraska, Dr. MILLER, offered an amendment that the administration should not employ any homosexuals in the administration of this Marshall plan to help spend that \$3,000,000,000. The House would not take that amendment. It seemed to think that those fellows might be all right or could be taken care of in some other way.

Then along came another amendment that the Republicans should have some part in the administration of the plan and, lo and behold, the majority turned that down.

So the Republicans ought to know where in the opinion of the administration they stand. A certain group, the homosexuals, are eligible for jobs but another group, Republicans, are not to be assured of a part in the carrying out of the Marshall plan, the expenditure of the \$3,000,000,000.

That is bad business and no one should fall for it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has expired.

THE RANKIN POLICY

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post, and its radio Red network, have been taking me to task and accusing the distinguished Senator at the other end of the Capitol [Mr. McCARTHY] of following the policy laid down by RANKIN in the House. I want to say that what we were trying to do in the Committee on Un-American Activities was to protect this country from her enemies at home and abroad.

They are also attacking me because they say that I cast the deciding vote the other day that knocked \$250,000,000 from the foreign-waste bill. If I am responsible for the adoption of that amendment then I ought to be congratulated, for it saved my salary for a period of more than 20,000 years.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

HON. STUART SYMINGTON

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I endorse fully the remarks my colleagues, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], and the others have made about Mr. Symington.

It has been my pleasure to have been in close contact with Mr. Symington's work as Secretary of the Air Force, and in his previous assignments in the Federal Government. I think everyone in Congress shares the opinion I have of him and they will agree with me when I say, W. Stuart Symington represents the highest type of public official.

The Air Force loses a great leader as the result of Mr. Symington's new assignment as Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, but the Air Force with the Nation as a whole will profit by the tact and determination Mr. Symington will take into his new position.

I regard Mr. Symington as the best possible selection President Truman could have made for the chairmanship of the National Security Resources Board. His experience, as a successful industrialist before entering Government service, then as Surplus Property Administrator and his appointments in the Defense Establishment, is, in my opinion, the kind of background needed for a man charged with the heavy responsibility of planning for military, industrial, and civilian mobilization for war.

The Congress shares the President's confidence in Mr. Symington's ability. I personally feel that he will continue to justify the great confidence we all have in him.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair respectfully suggests that we have a message from the President.

Mr. TABER. We ought to have a quorum to hear it.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 127]

Allen, Ill.	Donohue	Kee
Angell	Douglas	Kelly, N. Y.
Bailey	Doyle	Keogh
Barden	Eaton	Kunkel
Barrett, Pa.	Gavin	Lane
Battle	Gilmer	Lanham
Bennett, Fla.	Gordon	Latham
Biemiller	Granahan	Lichtenwalter
Bolton, Ohio	Grant	Linehan
Buchanan	Green	Lyle
Buckley, Ill.	Gregory	Lynch
Buckley, N. Y.	Hall	McConnell
Bulwinkle	Leonard W.	Mason
Burnside	Hand	Miles
Byrne, N. Y.	Hare	Miller, Md.
Carlyle	Hart	Monroney
Carroll	Hays, Ohio	Morrison
Case, S. Dak.	Hedrick	Multer
Chesney	Heffernan	Murphy
Chudoff	Heller	Nixon
Clemente	Hobbs	Norton
Combs	Hoffman, Ill.	O'Brien, Ill.
Coudert	Hull	O'Brien, Mich.
Dawson	Jackson, Calif.	O'Konski
Dingell	Javits	Pace

Patman	Sabath	Tollefson
Pfeifer	Sadowski	Towe
Joseph L.	St. George	Underwood
Pfeiffer	Sasser	Walsh
William L.	Scott	Welch
Philbin	Hugh D., Jr.	Wheeler
Powell	Shelley	Whitaker
Ramsey	Sims	White, Idaho
Redden	Smathers	Widnall
Reed, Ill.	Smith, Ohio	Willis
Reed, N. Y.	Staggers	Wolcott
Ribicoff	Sutton	Wood
Rivers	Taylor	Woodhouse

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 321 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 540)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

On March 31, 1950, I approved House Joint Resolution 398, "relating to cotton- and peanut-acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and to price supports for potatoes."

I approved this measure with reluctance, because it contains some provisions which seem to me to be definitely undesirable, and its other provisions merely undertake to alleviate defects in the existing farm program temporarily, without correcting those defects. Moreover, even this temporary relief, which is urgently needed, will require additional expenditures of public funds and increase the likelihood of future difficulties for the farm program.

One part of the bill, that relating to potatoes, is a step in the right direction for the long run. While it would do little or nothing to remedy for this year's crop the defects in the potato price-support program, it does hold out hope of improving this program for subsequent years. However, if each step made in improving the farm program in one place is to be accompanied by a step backward in another place, we will fail to make the advances in that program which are necessary if it is to retain the approval of the American people.

This joint resolution furnishes additional grounds for the charges that the present farm program is costly and piles up unmanageable surpluses at the same time that it maintains artificially high prices for agricultural commodities. What is needed is for the Congress to approach this problem with a view to correcting the fundamental shortcomings in the present farm program rather than patching it up with makeshift legislation.

In spite of the shortcomings of the present joint resolution, I have decided that the urgent need for the relief which it will give to cotton producers, and the promise which it holds out for making some improvement in the potato program, outweigh the defects of the measure.

The principal relief provided is in the form of additional cotton acreage allotments. The cotton acreage allotment system was revised by the Congress last year. In that legislation, against the advice of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Congress adopted an allotment system based primarily upon the farmer's acreage of crop land. The legislation provided in detail the method by which allotments were to be made. Just as the Secretary of Agriculture had warned, this legislation has had grossly inequitable results. Some cotton farmers were required to make little or no reduction in cotton acreage to comply with their allotments, other cotton farmers were required to reduce their acreage by as much as 80 percent. The present joint resolution merely provides additional cotton acreage allotments for this year to alleviate the hardship in those cases where the reductions have been inequitably severe. It does not remedy the basic defect in the present system of determining cotton acreage allotments. Indeed, in one respect it makes it even worse. It provides, in effect, that cotton acreage which is surrendered by one farmer and reallocated, even though it is not planted by any farmer, must continue in future years to be allotted to that same county and State. This provision is obviously not necessary to relieve present inequities and it is clearly unfair to areas where cotton farmers are being severely restricted in their plantings, and favors areas making little or no contribution to the reduction of cotton production.

I urge the Congress to revise the permanent laws regarding the cotton-acreage allotments and marketing quotas. Such legislation should provide for allotments to be based primarily upon each farmer's past planting history. Furthermore, it should give ample latitude to farmer-elected local committeemen, so that they may alleviate inequities among their neighbors and make adjustments for local conditions. These principles are generally in effect for all major crops but cotton, and experience has demonstrated their superiority to those embodied in the cotton legislation enacted last year, from which farmers are now seeking relief.

Sections 3, 4, and 5 of House Joint Resolution 398 deal with Irish potatoes. The most important of these is section 5, which provides that no price support shall be granted to potatoes for the crop year 1951 and later years unless marketing quotas are in effect. Since no marketing quotas for potatoes are permitted by present law, this section amounts to a policy declaration by the Congress that it intends to enact better price-support legislation for potatoes than we now have. With this purpose I am in hearty accord.

Successive Secretaries of Agriculture have been urging the Congress for several years to enact better legislation regarding potatoes, in order to bring supplies into line with demand, to provide better distribution of surplus potatoes, and to reduce the cost of the program to the Government. To amend present law to provide for effective marketing quotas would be a substantial improvement over

the present situation. It would not, however, in my judgment, be all that is necessary. I again urge the Congress to authorize a system of production payments for potatoes—and other perishable commodities—so that unavoidable surpluses can be sold to consumers and used, instead of taken off the market and largely wasted.

Sections 6 and 7 of the joint resolution deal with peanuts. Section 7 is designed to provide some relief for the peanut farmers in several States (particularly Alabama and Texas) whose acreage was cut especially severely under present law. I believe that the peanut farmers of the States affected should have such relief, and that is one of the reasons which led me to approve the joint resolution.

Section 6, however, is another matter. This section would permit the planting of peanuts to be increased substantially above the acreage allotments now established. The peanuts produced on these extra acres would not be eligible for price support, but would, instead, be sold for crushing, and the farmer would receive only what the resulting peanut oil would bring on the market. The domestic two-price system for peanuts thus established is subject to serious objections.

First, under present conditions, the production of peanuts for oil is unprofitable for the growers and is an uneconomic and wasteful use of agricultural resources. During the war and right afterward, when fats and oils were in seriously short supply, we needed peanut oil badly. Now that supplies of soybeans and other more economical sources of edible fats and oils are again sufficient, it would be foolish to go on using good land to produce peanuts for oil which would not yield a profit to the growers. I believe that peanut farmers will realize that it would not be to their own best interest to expand their plantings of peanuts greatly. Consequently, I do not expect large additional amounts of peanuts to be produced for oil as a result of this section. Nevertheless, this provision represents a breach in the integrity of the quota system upon which the support-price program depends. If it should be taken as a precedent for other crops, the whole support-price program might be endangered.

Second, the administrative difficulties of operating this two-price system for peanuts will be very great. In order to prevent the diversion of peanuts produced on the excess acres to the higher of the two price outlets, an extensive system of inspection, identification, and supervision will have to be developed. Administrative difficulties should not stand in the way of desirable programs, but in this case a complicated, costly, and annoying administrative network will be required for a very dubious purpose.

Above and beyond these specific objections to section 6, it may have very unfortunate implications for future years and other crops. If farmers do produce large quantities of peanuts for oil at no profit, there will inevitably be pressures for supporting the price of peanut oil in the future, which would only complicate matters further. Even more serious, of these special provisions for peanuts

were to be regarded as a precedent, it may be urged that similar provisions should be enacted for other crops, regardless of the disruption that could result to domestic and world markets. I believe it would be a very serious mistake for us to embark on such a course, and I do not regard this peanut provision as anything but a temporary aberration from proper legislation.

We face no small task in providing a system of agricultural legislation which will serve the needs of farmers for a fair income and will, at the same time, serve the needs of consumers for ample supplies of foods, fibers, and other crops at reasonable prices, and the needs of the whole Nation for a growing, expanding economy, and a healthy world trade. During the present postwar transition period, our agricultural legislation is necessarily costly, but we obviously cannot afford to add to those costs for purposes which will not contribute to the real, long-run interests of farmers or the Nation.

I urge the Congress to proceed to consider fundamental improvements in our agricultural legislation to make it more efficient, less costly, and more conducive to abundant production of farm crops, yielding a fair return to farmers, and selling at prices consumers can afford.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 3, 1950.

REFERENCE OF BILL

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7913) to establish and maintain a Federal fidelity trust fund and a Federal Surety Board to operate a procedure in lieu of surety bonds for all Federal employees who are required by law or regulation to furnish surety bonds, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is the bill?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. This is a bill which was referred to the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service but which should have been referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

It was introduced by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARST] to establish and maintain a fidelity trust fund for all Federal employees.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

ORLAND RECLAMATION PROJECT

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a resolution passed by the Committee on Public Lands concerning reclamation.

The Speaker. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the RECORD a resolu-

tion which was adopted by the Public Lands Committee of the House on March 29, 1950, and two acts relating to this procedure, concerning the expenditure of rehabilitation and betterment costs on certain reclamation projects. This resolution approves the findings of the Secretary of the Interior on this contract as outlined in his letter to both the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and to the Public Lands Committee of the House of Representatives.

On October 7, 1949, the President approved an act to provide for the return of rehabilitation and betterment costs of Federal reclamation projects, and on March 3, this year, an act was approved amending that act to a slight degree, whereby it becomes possible for the above-named committees to express their approval of the determination by the Secretary of the Interior of the terms of a contract for the repayment of rehabilitation and betterment costs on reclamation projects.

The two acts referred to and the resolution which was adopted on March 29, 1950, by the Public Lands Committee of the House are as follows:

Resolution concerning the expenditure of rehabilitation and betterment funds on the Orland project, California

Whereas the act of October 7, 1949 (Public Law 335, 81st Cong., 1st sess.), as amended by the act of March 3, 1950 (Public Law 451, 81st Cong., 2d sess.) provides that expenditure of funds specifically appropriated for rehabilitation and betterment of irrigation systems on projects governed by the Federal reclamation laws shall be made only after the organizations shall have obligated themselves for the return thereof in installments fixed in accordance with their ability to pay, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior; and

Whereas the determination of the Secretary of the Interior does not become effective until the expiration of 60 days after it has been submitted to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Public Lands of the House of Representatives or on a date prior to the expiration of such 60 days in any case in which each such committee approves an earlier date and notifies the Secretary, in writing, of such approval; and

Whereas in a letter dated March 16, 1950, the Secretary of the Interior submitted to the Committee on Public Lands his findings relating to the return of rehabilitation and betterment funds to be expended on the Orland project, California; and

Whereas the Committee on Public Lands has, in session with a quorum present, this day approved the findings of the Secretary of the Interior in these premises: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Lands give notice in writing to the Secretary of the Interior of its approval of his determination in these premises.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS,

J. HARDIN PETERSON,
Chairman.

Adopted this 29th day of March 1950.

[Public Law 335—81st Cong.]

[Ch. 650—1st sess.]

H. R. 1694

An act to provide for the return of rehabilitation and betterment costs of Federal reclamation projects.

Be it enacted, etc., That expenditures of funds hereafter specifically appropriated for

rehabilitation and betterment of irrigation systems on projects governed by the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto) shall be made only after the organizations concerned shall have obligated themselves for the return thereof in installments fixed in accordance with their ability to pay, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior in the light of their outstanding repayment obligations, and which shall, to the fullest practicable extent, be scheduled for return with their construction charge installments or otherwise scheduled as he shall determine. No such determination of the Secretary of the Interior shall become effective until the expiration of 60 days after it has been submitted to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Public Lands of the House of Representatives. The term "rehabilitation and betterment," as used in this act, shall mean maintenance, including replacements, which cannot be financed currently, as otherwise contemplated by the Federal reclamation laws in the case of operation and maintenance costs, but shall not include construction, the costs of which are returnable, in whole or in part, through "construction charges" as that term is defined in section 2 (d) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187). Such rehabilitation and betterment work may be performed by contract, by force account, or, notwithstanding any other law and subject only to such reasonable terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Interior shall deem appropriate for the protection of the United States, by contract entered into with the organization concerned whereby such organization shall perform such work.

SEC. 2. This act shall be deemed a supplement to the Federal reclamation laws.

Approved October 7, 1949.

[Public Law 451—81st Cong.]

[Ch. 47—2d sess.]

H. R. 7220

An act to expedite the rehabilitation of Federal reclamation projects in certain cases

Be it enacted, etc., That the second sentence of the act entitled "An act to provide for the return of rehabilitation and betterment costs of Federal reclamation projects," approved October 7, 1949, is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting a semicolon and the following: "except that, any such determination may become effective prior to the expiration of such 60 days in any case in which each such committee approves an earlier date and notifies the Secretary, in writing, of such approval: *Provided*, That when Congress is not in session the Secretary's determination, if accompanied by a finding by the Secretary that substantial hardship to the water users concerned or substantial further injury to the project works will result, shall become effective when the chairman and ranking minority member of each such committee shall file with the Secretary their written approval of said findings."

Approved March 3, 1950.

FACILITATION OF THE WORK OF THE FOREST SERVICE

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5839) to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is this conference report?

Mr. COOLEY. This is a conference report on the forestry bill. It is unanimous.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Has the gentleman from North Carolina advised the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] that he was going to call it up?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER], the author of the bill, has tried to communicate with the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE]. The gentleman from Kansas signed the conference report.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I cannot let this come up until the gentleman from Kansas is here.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] that I know nothing about this.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request for the time being.

THE CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

CERTAIN BENEFITS FOR ANNUITANTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4295) to provide certain benefits for annuitants who retired under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, prior to April 1, 1948.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, this is an important bill, a meritorious bill. However, it involves in the neighborhood of \$165,000,000, and I believe this is too much to allow to pass by unanimous consent; it should be debated. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5935) to provide for the construction of certain Veterans' Administration Hospitals, and for other purposes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that I am to be recognized on the 24th to call up this bill in the House, I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR THE SETTLEMENT OF CERTAIN PARTS OF ALASKA BY WAR VETERANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4424) to provide for the settlement of certain parts of Alaska by war veterans.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

EDUCATION OR TRAINING OF VETERANS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2596) relating to education or training of veterans

under title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, June 22, 1944.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I understand a rule is being granted on this bill and for that reason I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT FOR GUAM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4499) to provide a civil government for Guam, and for other purposes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

EXTENDING CERTAIN VETERANS' BENEFITS TO DEPENDENT HUSBANDS AND WIDOWERS OF FEMALE VETERANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6561) to extend certain veterans' benefits to or on behalf of dependent husbands and widowers of female veterans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it seems to me that this bill is lacking in merit and the cost of the bill, if put into effect, would be very considerable. Therefore, I object. I do not believe a young man who is not a veteran, who never wore the uniform of his country in time of war, should receive GI benefits upon marrying a War who, of course, by reason of her service is entitled to these benefits.

The SPEAKER. This requires three objections.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman does not seem to know what he is talking about.

Mr. YOUNG. The gentleman does know what he is talking about.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman does not know what he is talking about. He has interfered with this measure several times. If we cannot get it through at this time by unanimous consent, I am going to ask for recognition under suspension of the rules.

This measure applies to only a small number of veterans. The bill was unanimously passed on and reported by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and it is endorsed by every leading veterans' organization in America. I hope no one will object to it because it ought to pass and if we do not get it passed in this way I am going to ask the Speaker to recognize me under suspension of the rules.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What is the bill about?

Mr. RANKIN. It is a bill reading:

That as used in those provisions of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration relating to compensation, pension, retirement pay, and subsistence allowance the terms "wife" and "dependent" shall include a dependent husband, and the term "widow"

shall include a widower whenever his condition is such that, if his deceased wife were living, he would be dependent upon her for support.

The gentleman from Ohio laughs at that, but it is not a laughing matter. When a woman in the recent war gave her services and comes home disabled and her husband is sick or disabled they should be taken care of. The present laws on the subject are not uniform. This would establish a uniform rule. If the gentleman wants any further information, he will get the information provided in the report of the committee.

Mr. YOUNG. The gentleman does not want any further information.

Mr. RANKIN. I was talking to the gentleman who was asking for information. I was not talking to the gentleman from Ohio. This bill ought to pass, and I am going to object to its being passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. The question before the House is the gentleman's request that this bill be passed over, for the fourth time, and I have objected to his unanimous-consent request.

Mr. YOUNG. I will match my 37 months of service in World War II with the brief service of the gentleman from Mississippi in World War I.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am willing to admit that the gentleman from Ohio won the last war.

I now demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I make objection to its consideration.

There being no further objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That as used in those provisions of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration relating to compensation, pension, retirement pay, and subsistence allowance the terms "wife" and "dependent" shall include a dependent husband, and the term "widow" shall include a widower whenever his condition is such that, if his deceased wife were living, he would be dependent upon her for support: *Provided,* That benefits hereunder shall not be allowed a widower who has remarried, and where benefits are properly discontinued by reason of remarriage, they shall not thereafter be recommenced.

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect on the first day of the second calendar month next succeeding its enactment.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERISHABLE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5511) to amend the provisions of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930, relating to practices in the marketing of perishable agricultural commodities.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have some explanation of the bill.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the bill merely provides for an increase in license fees which are provided for in the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act from \$10 to \$15. This bill was unanimously reported by the Committee on Agriculture of the House, it is approved by the United States Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association and the National League of Wholesale Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Distributors, the two organizations which are directly affected by this act.

We have letters from these organizations and from the Department of Agriculture. The real situation is that it was originally intended that these fees should be sufficient in amount to defray the cost of administering the act, but in the last 2 years there has been a deficit. In 1948 there was a shortage of \$28,000 and in 1949 a shortage of \$40,000. By increasing the fees, we understand that the amount to be derived will be more than sufficient to defray the expenses involved.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, this will not cost the Federal Government any money, will it?

Mr. COOLEY. No. It is an effort to save the Federal Government some money.

This bill will increase the license fees from \$10 to \$15 a year and establish a PACA fund which is designed to cover the cost of administration of the act.

The Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act was adopted in 1930 to provide for the regulation of interstate commerce in perishable agricultural commodities. It provides for the licensing of all dealers and handlers of such commodities and for the administrative adjudication of complaints arising between shippers and licensees.

From the enactment of the act in 1930 until June 30, 1947, license fees and penalties collected and deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts, exceeded appropriations for the administration of the act by more than \$600,000. However, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948, there was collected approximately \$28,000 less than appropriations for carrying out the act. It was estimated that collections were about \$40,000 less than appropriations for the fiscal year 1949.

It is believed that the funds which are derived from annual license fees authorized under this measure should be adequate to meet the costs of administering the act and that if the funds so derived are made available for that purpose, it will be unnecessary for any additional money to be appropriated for the effective administration of the act.

The bill has the approval of the United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association and the National League of Wholesale Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Distributors. These two organizations represent almost all the persons directly affected by the act and who would be required to pay the increased fees.

Letters from those organizations approving the bill and a letter from the

Department of Agriculture approving the measure, are included in the report accompanying the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930 (7 U. S. C., sec. 499a and the following), is amended as follows:

Section 3 (b) of said act is amended to read as follows:

"Any person desiring any such license shall make application to the Secretary. The Secretary may by regulation prescribe the information to be contained in such application. Upon the filing of the application, and annually thereafter, the applicant shall pay a fee of \$15, which shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as a special fund, without fiscal-year limitation, to be designated as the 'PACA fund,' which shall be available for all expenses necessary to the administration of this act, the act to prevent the destruction or dumping of farm produce, approved March 3, 1927 (7 U. S. C. 491-497), and the Export Apple and Pear Act, approved June 10, 1933 (7 U. S. C. 531-539): *Provided*, That financial statements prescribed by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget for the last completed fiscal year, and as estimated for the current and ensuing fiscal years, shall be included in the budget as submitted to the Congress annually."

Sec. 2. Section 4 (a) of said act is amended to read as follows: "Whenever an applicant has paid the prescribed fee the Secretary, except as provided elsewhere in this act, shall issue to such applicant a license, which shall entitle the licensee to do business as a commission merchant and/or dealer and/or broker unless and until it is suspended or revoked by the Secretary in accordance with the provisions of this act, or is automatically suspended under section 7 (d) of this act, but said license shall automatically terminate on any anniversary date thereof unless the annual fee has been paid: *Provided*, That notice of the necessity of paying the annual fee shall be mailed at least 30 days before the anniversary date: *Provided, further*, That if the annual fee is not paid by the anniversary date the licensee may obtain a renewal of that license at any time within 30 days by paying a fee of \$20, which shall be deposited in the PACA fund provided for by section 3 (b)."

Sec. 3. Section 15 of said act is amended to read as follows: "The Secretary may make such rules, regulations, and orders as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, and may cooperate with any department or agency of the Government, any State, Territory, District, or possession, or department, agency, or political subdivision thereof, or any person; and shall have the power to appoint, remove, and fix the compensation of such officers and employees not in conflict with existing law, and make such expenditures for rent outside the District of Columbia, printing, binding, telegrams, telephones, lawbooks, books of reference, publications, furniture, stationery, office equipment, travel, and other supplies and expenses, including reporting services, as shall be necessary to the administration of this act in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, from the PACA fund provided for by section 3 (b) and any supplements to such fund, and as may be appropriated for by Congress; and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary for such purposes. This act shall not abrogate nor nullify any other statute, whether State or Federal, dealing with the same subjects of this act, but it is intended that all such statutes shall remain in full force and

effect except insofar only as they are inconsistent herewith or repugnant hereto."

SEC. 4. Add a new provision as follows:

"Sec. 19. Any unexpended balances of appropriations for the current fiscal year, and any subsequent appropriations, made to carry out the acts referred to in section 3 (b) hereof, may be deposited in the PACA fund."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 4, strike out "PACA" and insert "Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act."

Page 3, line 6, strike out "PACA" and insert "Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act."

Page 3, line 23, strike out "PACA" and insert "Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act."

Page 4, line 13, strike out "PACA" and insert "Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE VETERANS' PREFERENCE ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7185) to amend Public Law 359, chapter 287, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DOLLINGER, Mr. KLEIN, and Mr. MARCANTONIO objected.

AMENDING FOREIGN AGENTS REGISTRATION ACT OF 1938

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4336) to amend section 2 (a) and section 7 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, to make failure of registration a continuing offense, and to continue the obligation of officers, directors, and persons acting as such, to comply with the act despite dissolution of a foreign agent.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first paragraph of section 2 (a) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, entitled "An act to require the registration of certain persons employed by agencies to disseminate propaganda in the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 8, 1938, as amended (56 Stat. 248), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. (a) No person shall act as an agent of a foreign principal unless he has filed with the Attorney General a true and complete registration statement and supplements thereto as required by this section 2 (a) and section 2 (b) hereof or unless he is exempt from registration under the provisions of this act. Except as hereinafter provided, every person who is an agent of a foreign principal on the effective date of this act shall, within 10 days thereafter and every person who becomes an agent of a foreign principal after the effective date of this act shall, within 10 days thereafter, file with the Attorney General, in duplicate, a registration statement, under oath, on a form prescribed by the Attorney General, of which one copy shall be transmitted promptly by the Attorney General to the Secretary of State for such comment, if any, as the Secretary of State may desire to make from the point of view of the foreign relations of the United States. Failure of the Attorney General so to transmit such copy shall not be a bar to prosecution under this act. The obligation

of an agent of a foreign principal to file a registration statement shall, after the tenth day of his becoming or acting as such agent, continue from day to day, and discontinuance of such activity shall not relieve such agent from his obligation to file a registration statement for the period during which he acted within the United States as an agent of a foreign principal. The registration statement shall include the following, which shall be regarded as material for the purposes of this act:

SEC. 2. Section 7 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 7. Each officer, or person performing the functions of an officer, and each director, or person performing the functions of a director, of an agent of a foreign principal which is not an individual shall be under obligation to cause such agent to execute and file a registration statement and supplements thereto as and when such filing is required under sections 2 (a) and 2 (b) hereof and shall also be under obligation to cause such agent to comply with all the requirements of sections 4 (a), 4 (b), and 5 and all other requirements of this act. Dissolution of any organization acting as an agent of a foreign principal shall not relieve any officer, or person performing the functions of an officer, or any director, or person performing the functions of a director, from complying with the provisions of this section. In case of failure of any such agent of a foreign principal to comply with any of the requirements of this act, each of its officers, or persons performing the functions of officers, and each of its directors, or persons performing the functions of directors, shall be subject to prosecution therefor."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to see this bill pass, because the original legislation was one of those bills that was recommended by a special committee of which I was chairman, back 15 years ago, investigating communism, nazism, and fascism; and, I might say, it is the only special committee investigating subversive activities in America in the last three or four decades that has recommended legislation which was finally enacted into law.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OFFICERS' RETIREMENT BENEFITS TO CERTAIN ENLISTED MEN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2559) to authorize the extension of officers' retirement benefits to certain persons who while serving as enlisted men in the Army of the United States during World War II were given battlefield promotions to officer grade and were incapacitated for active service as a result of enemy action.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I would like to make a brief statement. The purpose of S. 2559 is to authorize the extension of certain officers' retirement benefits to enlisted men who served during World War II, were given battlefield promotions to officer grade, and who are incapacitated by reason of enemy action. It will extend to them certain benefits of retirement, and it is a very worthy bill. I would like to state that the Committee

on Armed Services, in considering my companion bill, H. R. 6276, stated that my bill was approved but due to parliamentary procedure, it was necessary to consider the Senate bill. A clarifying and perfecting amendment is brought in by reason of the fact that subsequent to the passage of this legislation in the Senate, the Career Compensation Act was passed last fall as Public Law 351; and this amendment will give the option to the people eligible under these conditions to elect the appropriate mode of retirement. Such eligible persons would have the same option to come under the Career Compensation Act as any other person who was retired prior to its enactment.

I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I want to say that the able and distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma has been very diligent in pursuing the merits of this bill. He was very helpful in cooperating with the subcommittee of which I was chairman. The committee wanted to report his bill, but due to the parliamentary situation, it was not able to do so. The gentleman from Oklahoma is certainly entitled to great credit and praise for his able efforts in steering this bill through the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any person who while serving on active duty as an enlisted man in the Army of the United States at any time during the period between December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945—

(1) was appointed or recommended by his commanding officer or superior military authority for a battlefield appointment as a commissioned officer in the Army of the United States;

(2) while performing the duties of a commissioned officer, was injured in line of duty incident to combat with the enemy;

and who, subsequent to being so injured as a result of that appointment or recommendation was ordered to active duty as a commissioned officer in the Army of the United States, or the Air Force of the United States, shall, if he is found by an Army or an Air Force retiring board to be incapacitated for active service and to have sustained such incapacity as the result of the injury which was incurred by him in line of duty incident to combat with the enemy while he was performing the duties of a commissioned officer and if the finding of the retiring board is approved by the President, be entitled to receive the same retirement benefits to which he would be entitled under the provisions of section 5 of the act of April 3, 1939, as amended, if he had been serving as a commissioned officer in the Army of the United States at the time he incurred such injury.

Sec. 2. No additional or back pay or allowances for any period prior to the date of enactment hereof shall accrue to any person solely by reason of the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 9, after the comma, strike out down to and including the word "injury" on line 20 and insert "shall be considered to have been serving on active duty as a commissioned officer when so injured, for the purpose of determining entitlement to phys-

ical disability retirement benefits in effect at the time he was relieved from active duty: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 411 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (Public Law 351, 81st Cong.) shall apply to persons qualified for retirement benefits under this act: *Provided further*, That nothing contained in this act shall preclude persons entitled to retirement benefits under the provisions of this act from computing their retirement pay in accordance with the disability retirement laws in effect prior to the effective date of the Career Compensation Act of 1949."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAMP JOSEPH T. ROBINSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3783) authorizing the transfer of part of Camp Joseph T. Robinson to the State of Arkansas.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., that the Secretary of National Defense be, and he is hereby, authorized to transfer to the State of Arkansas that part of Camp Joseph T. Robinson that was licensed by the Secretary of the Army to the Military Department of the State of Arkansas on the twenty-fifth day of March 1947, consisting of 34,000 acres, more or less, and particularly described in the aforementioned license, copies thereof being on file in the offices of the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, the Chief of Engineers, and the Adjutant General of the State of Arkansas, together with all buildings, improvements thereon, and all appurtenances and utilities belonging or appertaining thereto, including water line from Little Rock to Camp Joseph T. Robinson, Ark., and to execute and deliver in the name of the United States in its behalf any and all contracts, conveyances, or other instruments as may be necessary to effectuate the said transfer.

Sec. 2. Such conveyance shall contain a provision that said property shall be used primarily for training of the National Guard and for other military purposes, and that if the State of Arkansas shall cease to use the property so conveyed for the purposes intended, then title thereto shall immediately revert to the United States.

Sec. 3. Such conveyance shall contain the further provision that whenever the Congress of the United States shall declare a state of war or other national emergency, or the President declares a state of emergency to exist, and upon the determination by the Secretary of National Defense that the property so conveyed is useful or necessary for military, air, or naval purposes, or in the interest of national defense, the United States shall have a right to reenter upon such property and use the same or any part thereof for the duration of such state of war or other national emergency and upon the cessation thereof plus 6 months said property is to revert to the State of Arkansas in substantially as good condition as it was at the date of entry.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "National Defense" and insert "the Army."

Page 2, line 8, after "transfer", insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That there shall be excluded from the conveyance hereinabove provided for, the following-described lands: The west half of the east half of the northwest quarter of section 1; the west half of the west half of section 1; the

east half of section 2; and a portion of the west half of section 2 described as follows: Beginning at the northeast corner of the northwest quarter of section 2; thence west one hundred and eighty feet to the intersection of Sixty-second Street (Old Remount or Batesville Road) and Maryland Avenue; thence in a south westerly direction to a point nine hundred feet west of the southeast corner of the southwest quarter of section 2 (the intersection of New York Avenue and the reservation boundary); thence east to the southeast corner of the southwest quarter of section 2; thence along the north-south center line of section 2 to the point of beginning. All in township 2 north, range 12 west, containing approximately five hundred seventy-one and three-tenths acres, more or less: *And provided further*, That there shall be reserved to the United States all minerals, including oil and gas, in the lands authorized for conveyance by this section."

Page 3, line 9, after "United States", change the period to a comma and insert "and, in addition, all improvements made by the State of Arkansas during its occupancy shall vest in the United States without payment of compensation therefor."

Page 3, line 20, after "have", strike out "a right to reenter upon such property and use the same or any part thereof" and insert "the right, without obligation to make payment of any kind, to reenter upon the property and use the same or any part thereof, including any and all improvements made by the State of Arkansas."

Page 4, line 3, after "Arkansas", strike out "in substantially as good condition as it was at the date of entry" and insert a colon and the following: "*Provided, however*, That the United States shall have no obligation to restore the property in any way, but the Secretary of the Army may, if he deems it in the best interests of the United States, convey to the State of Arkansas all or any of the improvements made by the United States during its occupancy of the property."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RETROCESSION OF CERTAIN LAND TO MASSACHUSETTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4433) to make retrocession to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts over certain land in Shirley, Mass.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the United States hereby makes retrocession to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts of jurisdiction over the following-described land:

All of that piece or parcel of land which was ceded to the United States by chapter 456 of the acts of 1921 of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and which lies within the location of a certain highway in said town of Shirley running from the Shirley depot of the Boston & Maine Railroad to that part of said Shirley known as Mitchelville, a plan whereof is recorded in the Middlesex South District Registry of Deeds of 1947 as plan No. 1600, in book 7209, at page 69, or which lies within that part of Front Street Extended in said Shirley which runs from said highway to the entrance gate of that part of Fort Devens formerly known as Lovell General Hospital North, and which piece or parcel of land is bounded and more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a concrete bound shown as transit point station numbered 68 on a plan numbered 6101-208 and entitled "Construction Division, War Department, Washington,

D. C., Camp Devens, Massachusetts Boundary Map," dated May 27, 1920, and running south sixty-nine degrees thirty-one minutes thirty seconds west, three hundred and sixty-one and twenty-one one-hundredths feet to station numbered 69, thence running south twenty degrees ten minutes no seconds east, sixteen and eighty-five one-hundredths feet to station numbered seventy, thence running south seventy-eight degrees fifty-eight minutes no seconds east, one hundred and eighty-six feet to station numbered 71, thence running south seven degrees forty-eight minutes thirty seconds west, fourteen and eighty-eight one-hundredths feet to station numbered 72, thence running north eighty-one degrees fifty-five minutes thirty seconds west, two hundred eighty-two and fifty-five one-hundredths feet to station numbered 73, thence running north forty-four degrees thirty-six minutes no seconds east, eighty-nine and six one-hundredths feet to station numbered 74, thence running north sixty-nine degrees forty-eight minutes thirty seconds east, three hundred and thirty-three and seventy-seven one-hundredths feet to station numbered 75, thence running north sixty-seven degrees twenty-three minutes thirty seconds east, one thousand four hundred and four and twenty-four one-hundredths feet to station numbered 76, thence running south five degrees fifty minutes no seconds west, thirty-seven and fifty-three one-hundredths feet to station numbered 77, thence running north sixty-seven degrees twenty-three minutes thirty seconds east, four hundred and sixty-two feet to station numbered 78, thence running south three degrees eleven minutes thirty seconds east, seventy-one and four one-hundredths feet more or less to the southerly side line of the location of said highway running from the Shirley depot to Mitchelville, as shown on said plan numbered 1600, thence running south sixty-seven degrees twenty-three minutes thirty seconds west, one thousand seven hundred and eighty-three and thirty-eight one-hundredths feet more or less by said southerly side line of the location of said highway to a point on course 67-68 as shown on said plan numbered 6101-208, thence running north twenty-two degrees eleven minutes no seconds west, fifty-four and sixty-six one-hundredths feet more or less to station numbered 68 and the point of beginning, covered by a certain grant from the Secretary of War to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, dated August 12, 1941, authorized by the act of Congress approved July 5, 1884 (23 Stat. 104).

SEC. 2. This retrocession of jurisdiction shall take effect upon acceptance by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, line 6, strike out "hence" and insert "thence."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TWO ROCK UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4732) to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain lands to the Two Rock Union School District, a political subdivision of the State of California, in Sonoma County, Calif., and to furnish said school district water free of charge.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to convey to the Two Rock Union School District, a political subdivision of the State

of California, without consideration, certain lands and premises in the ownership of the United States of America, said lands and premises being described as follows: Being a portion of the Rancho Laguna de San Antonio or Bojorques Rancho and also a portion of that seven and two one-hundredths-acre tract described as parcel 1 of tract 3-A awarded to the United States of America under Case Numbered 4527, in the District Court of the United States in and for the Northern District of California, Northern Division, a certified copy of which judgment is recorded in book 572, Official Records, page 52, Sonoma County Records, and being more further described as follows: Commencing at a point in the center of Spring Hill Road, said point being at the southeast corner of the Two Rock Cemetery as shown in that certain deed recorded in book 64 of deeds, page 137, Sonoma County Records, said point of commencement also being north twenty-six degrees thirty minutes west one thousand seven hundred fifty-four and twenty-eight one-hundredths feet from the southwest corner of special location numbered 4 of the Bojorques Rancho; thence from said point of commencement south twenty-six degrees thirty minutes east two hundred ninety-one and twenty one-hundredths feet to the point of beginning of the parcel to be described; thence south eighty-nine degrees fifty minutes west thirty-five and eighty-three one-hundredths feet to a point on the westerly line of Spring Hill Road; thence continuing south eighty-nine degrees fifty minutes west four hundred ninety-two and ninety-seven one-hundredths feet along a fence line to a point; thence leaving said fence line south twenty-six degrees thirty minutes east four hundred ninety-two and ninety-seven one-hundredths feet to a point; thence north eighty-nine degrees fifty minutes east four hundred ninety-two and ninety-seven one-hundredths feet to a point on the said westerly line of Spring Hill Road; thence continuing north eighty-nine degrees fifty minutes east thirty-five and eighty-three one-hundredths feet to a point in the aforesaid center of Spring Hill Road; thence along the aforesaid center of Spring Hill Road, north twenty-six degrees thirty minutes west four hundred ninety-two and ninety-seven one-hundredths feet to the point of beginning. Containing five and thirty-six one-hundredths acres, more or less, of which thirty-six one-hundredths acre, more or less, is now used for road purposes.

SEC. 2. It shall be made a condition of the deed of conveyance that the tract of land so conveyed shall be maintained by such school district only for school or other educational purposes. If such school district ceases to use such tract for such purposes or attempts to alienate all or any part of such tract, title thereto shall revert to the United States. The deed shall reserve to the United States the interests in fissionable material as provided in Executive Order 9908, December 5, 1947.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to furnish to the Two Rock Union School District, Sonoma County, Calif., water free of charge from the water supply of the Two Rock Ranch Army Base located partly in Marin County and partly in Sonoma County, State of California.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 2, strike out "parcel 1" and insert "parcels 3 and 4."

Strike out sections 2 and 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 2. The deed of conveyance shall provide that relocation of the existing security fence occasioned by the conveyance shall be made by the Two Rock Union School District without cost to the United States: *Provided further*, That the tract of land so conveyed shall be maintained by such school district

only for school or other educational purposes. If such school district ceases to use such tract for such purposes or attempts to alienate all or any part of such tract purposes or attempts to alienate all or any part of said tract, title thereto shall revert to the United States. The deed shall reserve to the United States the interests in fissionable material as provided in Executive Order 9908, December 5, 1947.

"Sec. 3. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to furnish to the Two Rock Union School District, Sonoma County, Calif., water from the water supply of the Two Rock Army base in Marin and Sonoma Counties, Calif., within such limitations and under such conditions as he shall prescribe, and the school district shall reimburse the United States therefor at a rate not to exceed the actual cost of furnishing the service."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REDUCING RESIDENCE QUALIFICATION IN DIVORCE PROCEEDINGS IN HAWAII

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 175) to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act so as to reduce the residence qualification in divorce proceedings from 2 years to 1 year.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this bill reduces the residence requirement in divorce proceedings in Hawaii from 2 years to 1 year. I would feel much better if it increased it from 2 years to 3 years. There are too many divorces being granted in the United States and there is too much opportunity under loose laws for them. I am very sorry to see the Hawaiian Legislature request the Congress to amend its organic act in this respect. Frankly, I think it is about time in order to preserve family life in Hawaii, and in America that the laws of the several States be tightened against divorce rather than liberalized. I am not going to ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice. I object to its consideration, because I am against it in conscience.

PERMITTING WOMEN TO SERVE ON JURIES IN HAWAII

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 176) to amend section 83 of the Hawaiian Organic Act to provide that women may serve on juries in the Territory of Hawaii.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second sentence of section 83 of the Hawaiian Organic Act (U. S. C., 1490 ed., title 48, sec. 635) is amended—

(a) By inserting after "all juries shall hereafter be constituted without reference to the race or place of nativity of the jurors" a comma and the following "or to their sex"; and

(b) By striking out the word "male."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF ADJUTANT GENERAL OF HAWAII

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 179) to provide for the appointment of the adjutant general of the Territory of Hawaii.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 66 of the act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 166, 199; 32 U. S. C., sec. 12), is amended by inserting after the word "Territories" in the proviso thereof a comma and the phrase "except the Territory of Hawaii," and that section 80 of the act of April 30, 1900 (31 Stat. 141, 156; 48 U. S. C., sec. 546), as amended, is amended by inserting the words "the adjutant general" after the word "attorney-general."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LESSEES UNDER HOMESTEAD LEASES, HAWAII

The Clerk call the bill (H. R. 5984) to approve Joint Resolution 12 enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii in the regular session of 1949, relating to the granting of land patents in fee simple to certain lessees under homestead leases.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Joint Resolution 12 enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii in the regular session of 1949 and entitled "Joint resolution directing the Commissioner of Public Lands to grant land patents in fee simple to certain lessees under homestead leases of 999 years and repealing sections 4566 to 4588, both inclusive, of the Revised Laws of Hawaii 1945," is hereby approved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING TIME LIMITS FOR AWARD OF CERTAIN DECORATIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6825) to extend the time limits for the award of certain decorations, and for other purposes.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may we have an explanation of this bill?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. This bill seeks to extend the time limits for the award of certain medals and decorations by the United States Armed Forces. It does not include any decorations by foreign governments, and no White House aides are included in the legislation.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, any decoration, or device in lieu of decoration, heretofore authorized by act of Congress, Executive order or by the Secretary of Defense, the respective Secretaries of the Army, Navy, or Air Force, or in any other manner may be awarded at any time not later than 2 years subsequent to the date of the approval of this Act for any act or service that was performed between De-

cember 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945: *Provided,* That the written recommendation for the award of the decoration, or device in lieu of decoration, for such act or service be made not later than 1 year subsequent to the date of approval of this act.

SEC. 2. The act of June 26, 1946 (60 Stat. 309), is hereby repealed.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out all after the words "authorized by" down to and including "manner" in line 7, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "act of Congress to be awarded to any person for any act or service performed while on active duty in the military or naval forces of the United States or while serving with such forces."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article on the state of Europe by Roscoe Drummond.

Mr. PASSMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a table of figures.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. BARTLETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

Mr. CROOK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an excerpt from the CIO Union News of Indianapolis, Ind.

Mr. EVINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. TAURIELLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter and a resolution received from the American Protestant Hospital Association.

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. YOUNG asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in one to include an editorial, in the other to include a short statement of the secretary of state of Ohio.

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article appearing in the Reader's Digest.

Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include newspaper editorials and articles.

Mr. L. CARL ANDERSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial appearing in the Deseret News of Salt Lake City relating to an address on farm legislation by his colleague, Mr. LOVRE.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article by Walter Johnson entitled "Country Lawyer."

Mr. COLE of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks on the omnibus appropriation bill and include tabular matter.

Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include newspaper articles.

Mr. RIEHLMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech made by Mr. LOVRE at Salt Lake City on the farm program.

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article entitled "Unfair Attack."

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JACOBS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article from the Washington Post.

Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from the Washington Post and from the Marine News of New York.

Mr. WERDEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. SADLAK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. MCCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two separate instances and in each to include an article.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech by Mr. WALTER, at Easton, Pa., on Friday, March 31, before the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. FURCOLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 193. Concurrent resolution providing for adjournment of the House until April 18, 1950.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 128]

Allen, Ill.	Hall,	Pfeifer,
Andrews	Leonard W.	Joseph L.
Angell	Hand	Pfeiffer,
Bailey	Hare	William L.
Barden	Hart	Philbin
Barrett, Pa.	Hays, Ohio	Plumley
Battle	Hébert	Powell
Bennett, Fla.	Hedrick	Ramsay
Biemiller	Heffernan	Redden
Bolling	Heller	Reed, Ill.
Bosone	Hobbs	Reed, N. Y.
Buchanan	Hoffman, Ill.	Ribicoff
Buckley, Ill.	Hull	Rivers
Buckley, N. Y.	Jackson, Calif.	Sabath
Bulwinkle	Javits	St. George
Burdick	Kee	Sasser
Burnside	Kelly, N. Y.	Scott,
Carlyle	Keogh	Hugh D. Jr.
Carroll	Kunkel	Shelley
Case, S. Dak.	Lane	Short
Cavalcante	Lanham	Simpson, Pa.
Celler	Latham	Sims
Chesney	Lichtenwalter	Smathers
Chudoff	Linehan	Smith, Ohio
Clement	Lyle	Staggers
Combs	Lynch	Sutton
Coudert	McConnell	Taylor
Davenport	McDonough	Tollefson
Davies, N. Y.	Mason	Towe
Dawson	Miles	Wadsworth
Dingell	Miller, Md.	Wagner
Donohue	Monroney	Walsh
Douglas	Morgan	Welch
Doyle	Multer	Wheeler
Gavin	Murphy	Whitaker
Gilmer	Nixon	White, Idaho
Gordon	Norton	Wickersham
Gossett	O'Brien, Ill.	Wildnall
Granahan	O'Brien, Mich.	Willis
Grant	O'Konski	Wolcott
Green	Pace	Wood
Gwinn	Patman	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 310 Members answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes; and pending that I ask unanimous consent that time for general debate be equally divided, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and one-half by myself; that debate be confined to the bill; and that following the reading of the first chapter of the bill, not to exceed 2 hours general debate be had before the reading of each subsequent chapter, one-half to be controlled by the chairman and one-half by the ranking minority member of the subcommittee in charge of the chapter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object. There has been a great deal of confusion

on both sides of the aisle as to the amount of general debate and also as to what are the plans for considering the bill. I understand the request is that we continue indefinitely, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and the other half by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, there is no disposition on the part of the committee to restrict any Member who wishes to debate this bill. We will not close general debate as long as anybody wants to talk.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. On either side?

Mr. CANNON. On either side. Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I think that is quite fair.

Mr. CANNON. So far as we are concerned, general debate is unlimited.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I appreciate the views of the gentleman from Missouri. I want to say that general debate on appropriation bills is historic. It is the only opportunity a great many Members have to express themselves on different subjects. There was a rumor we were going to try to close debate today or tomorrow and try to read the bill by next Thursday. Of course, it is impossible to finish the bill by that time, and I am delighted with the assurance of the gentleman from Missouri that we are to have unlimited debate.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, speaking for this side of the House, I have only had a request for 15 minutes under general debate. Whenever there is nobody to debate, of course, we will proceed to read the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Well, there might a Democrat or two who will want to speak after we get through.

Mr. CANNON. Either Democrat or Republican who desires to speak will be afforded that opportunity, and no limitation will be placed upon him as long as he talks about the bill.

I may say, however, that the idea of taking up time which should be devoted to the discussion of the appropriation bill with a discussion of extraneous matters, or on subjects, which have no germaneness or relevancy to the bill, is one of the evils which we seek to cure by bringing in all appropriations in a single bill. The attention of the House and the country should be centered on this one bill. If anyone desires to discuss something foreign to the bill, let him speak in the morning or secure a special order and take all the time he needs. This bill is too important to be sidetracked by some Member's whim. We should have full debate on this bill. We want all the information we can get on it. If anybody wants to talk about it, he is perfectly free to talk about it as long as he likes, but if he is not interested in the bill and wants to talk about something else, let him select some more opportune time rather than detract from the consideration of the pending bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The quorum call a few moments ago disclosed the fact that 303 Members are here. Does not the gentleman from Missouri believe we should have the full member-

ship present when we vote on this most important bill?

Mr. CANNON. I am not the keeper of the conscience of other Members of the House. If they want to stay away, that is their prerogative and that is for them to decide. If they want to represent their constituents by remaining away from the sessions of the House, it is not incumbent upon me to raise any objection.

But I give notice now that if general debate is concluded we will read the bill for amendment. The House will proceed to business as long as the Committee on Appropriations has a bill on the floor.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman realizes that both he and I are members of the economy bloc, and I appreciate the good work he has already done.

Mr. CANNON. I welcome the gentleman's cooperation. And I trust we will have the assistance of the gentleman in economizing on this bill by defending it against proposals to increase it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Both of us being in the so-called economy bloc, we will naturally want the largest possible attendance of Members when we vote on the bill. When we have a large number of Members present the views which I hold are more likely to prevail.

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman will have his Members present, I assure him we will have our Members present.

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, what is the gentleman's proposal about debate on this measure?

Mr. CANNON. To continue general debate indefinitely, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from New York and one-half by myself.

Mr. RANKIN. When you finish general debate is it the gentleman's intention to take the bill up under the 5-minute rule?

Mr. CANNON. At the conclusion of general debate we will read the first chapter. There will be not to exceed 2 hours of general debate on each subsequent chapter, following which we will read the chapter under the 5-minute rule, as we have done heretofore under the rules of the House, and under control of the committee responsible for the chapter.

Mr. MICHENER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I want to get this clear. As I understand, we are to proceed with general debate, and anything that has anything to do with the entire bill will be in order under the general debate.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MICHENER. Debate on the bill may run for days.

Mr. CANNON. As long as anybody wants to talk on it.

Mr. MICHENER. At the conclusion of that general debate, chapter 1 may be debated for another 2 hours?

Mr. CANNON. Chapter 1 consists of one item only, an item which requires no general debate. At the conclusion of general debate we will read the first chapter and then have not to exceed

2 hours of general debate on the second chapter. We will then proceed to read the chapter for amendment.

Mr. MICHENER. That will be repeated on every chapter?

Mr. CANNON. On every subsequent chapter.

Mr. MICHENER. Then the chapter will be read under the 5-minute rule and all amendments thereto will be disposed of before the succeeding chapter is debated for 2 hours?

Mr. CANNON. Exactly.

Mr. MICHENER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KEEFE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I should like to get this clear if I can. The gentleman has said that he will proceed with unlimited debate, and that he does not want to restrict anyone in the matter of general debate, except that the debate shall be confined to the bill. But then the unanimous-consent request further provides that one-half of this unlimited time shall be controlled by the gentleman from Missouri and one-half by the gentleman from New York. The gentleman from Missouri has indicated that he has had requests for only 15 minutes of that time. I am unable to understand just how this division of an unlimited, unnamed amount of time is to be made.

Suppose the gentleman from Missouri has no further request for time after 30 minutes. Are we to understand that that will be the extent of time available to the other side?

Mr. CANNON. In such event, I shall be glad to yield any portion of my time to either side of the aisle. I shall be especially glad to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin. It will be a pleasure to yield the gentleman all the time he desires.

Mr. KEEFE. I am very happy to hear the gentleman say that because I would like at least an hour to discuss some features of this bill in general debate which cannot be discussed without at least that much time, in order that Members may have as much information as possible on the subject.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman shall have time without restriction.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, are we to understand that the gentleman from Missouri, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, intends to make a point of order against any Member speaking out of order? How is the gentleman going to determine whether or not a Member is speaking out of order when there is something like \$27,000,000,000 involved in this appropriation which certainly covers most of the business of America.

If the gentleman is going to make a point of order against a Member talking about the economy of our Nation and the problems of the people, surely debate is going to be badly limited and we will not be doing justice to the American people who ought to have full information.

Mr. CANNON. That would be for the Chair to determine.

Mr. JENSEN. Of course, Mr. Speaker, I will not object, except to say that I

trust and am sure the majority of the Members of the House hope that the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] will not make points of order against Members on the ground that they are speaking out of order when so much is involved in this bill. I think we should have the greatest leeway to discuss these things.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would think that this appropriation bill actually being 11 bills in one, and covering everything in the Government, a Member speaking on the bill would have a rather wide range.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the Speaker. I was hoping the Speaker would say just that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] A quorum is not present.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 129]

Allen, Ill.	Grant	O'Konski
Anderson, Calif.	Green	Pace
Andrews	Gregory	Patman
Angell	Hall	Pfeiffer,
Bailey	Leonard W.	Joseph L.
Barden	Hand	Pfeiffer,
Barrett, Pa.	Hart	William L.
Battle	Hays, Ohio	Philbin
Bennett, Fla.	Hébert	Plumley
Biemiller	Heffernan	Powell
Bolling	Heller	Ramsay
Buchanan	Hobbs	Redden
Buckley, Ill.	Hoffman, Ill.	Reed, Ill.
Buckley, N. Y.	Hollifield	Reed, N. Y.
Bulwinkle	Hull	Regan
Burdick	Jackson, Calif.	Ribicoff
Byrne, N. Y.	Javits	Rivers
Carlyle	Kee	Sabath
Carroll	Kelly, N. Y.	St. George
Case, S. Dak.	Keogh	Sasser
Cavalcante	Kunkel	Scott, Hardie
Celler	Lane	Scott,
Chesney	Lanham	Hugh D., Jr.
Chipfield	Latham	Short
Chudoff	Lichtenwalter	Simpson, Pa.
Clemente	Linehan	Sims
Combs	Lyle	Smathers
Coudert	Lynch	Smith, Ohio
Cox	McConnell	Sutton
Davenport	McDonough	Taylor
Davis, Wis.	Mason	Teague
Dawson	Miles	Towe
Dingell	Miller, Md.	Wagner
Donohue	Mitchell	Walsh
Douglas	Monroney	Welch
Doyle	Morgan	Wheeler
Elliott	Morton	Whitaker
Engel, Mich.	Multer	White, Idaho
Gavin	Murphy	Widnall
Gilmer	Nixon	Wolcott
Gordon	Norton	Wolverton
Gossett	O'Brien, Ill.	Wood
Granahan	O'Brien, Mich.	Woodhouse

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 306 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman

from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7786, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, we have called the roll this morning three times in 2 hours. It is to be regretted that a deliberate and carefully organized filibuster is under way on this particular bill. The time of the House is valuable, and especially so just at this time. Not only should we be proceeding with the business of the House and conserving the time of the House but we should have some regard for the taxpayers whose money we are wasting in this filibuster. It costs the taxpayers over \$75,000 a day to run the House 5 days a week. That means thousands of dollars for every hour we waste in unnecessary roll calls and dilatory tactics in which the gentlemen on that side of the aisle are indulging this afternoon.

I might add that the further effect of this filibuster is to keep the House here longer this summer. There is no reason why we should not go ahead and pass this bill and get away from here before June 30 and go home and learn what the people are thinking. Partisan tactics like this not only delay the proceedings of the House and interfere with the consideration of this bill but also delay adjournment next June.

I trust we may have a little cooperation from the other side of the aisle in transacting the business of the House and the Nation. It is to be regretted that it will go out to the people of the United States tomorrow that there was a deliberate program here this afternoon to obstruct the orderly consideration under the rules of the House of one of the important bills of this session of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, we submit to the House today the largest peacetime appropriation bill in the history of the Nation—the largest in the history of any nation since time began. It is indissolubly associated with the welfare and prosperity of the people, and the security and preservation of our form of Government. And it comes at a critical period in national postwar adjustment and international relations.

The bill, with an amendment providing for foreign aid which will be offered by direction of the committee, and the tabulation of permanent and indefinite appropriations in the report, sets out in full, and in understandable terms, the total proposed expenditures of the United States Government for the fiscal year of 1951. Taken in connection with the latest authoritative estimate of the national income for 1951, and the daily Treasury report on the public debt, we have a comprehensive picture which shows at a glance the financial condition of the Federal Government; whether the Nation is living within its income; the effect of any amendment; of any pro-

posed increase or decrease in appropriations, and the impact of such increase or decrease on Treasury balances and the national credit.

For more than a century we have been passing appropriation bills and spending money without reference to any definite central fiscal program, without any specific knowledge of their ultimate effect on national finances or national solvency. But in this bill the Nation is brought face to face with its fiscal problems and to that extent is in a better position to make its choice between unlimited appropriations and deficit spending.

In one respect, Mr. Chairman, this bill may be said to be not only an appropriation bill, but a tax bill as well. There was a time when we drafted the appropriation bills on the basis of the amount of revenue we had to spend. We shaped the coat to the material available. But we have long since ceased to consider appropriations from the point of view of what we have to spend. We now make the appropriations and spend the money and taxes must be levied to conform to the appropriation bills and to supply the money we have already spent.

We now shape the coat according to the latest fashion or caprice, and when the cloth is insufficient, we simply borrow more material, as a matter of course.

Contrary to the intentions of the founders of our Government—and in contravention of every rule of sound business procedure—the House by multiplying authorizations and increasing appropriations has made the Committee on Ways and Means a mere port of call and I am today asking the members of that great committee to cooperate with us in opposing increases in the appropriations carried in this particular bill and in discouraging the enactment of further bills authorizing new and expanded appropriations when we do not have enough money to finance the authorizations already on the statute books.

This bill is, in effect, both an appropriation bill and a tax bill. If you make appropriations here, you must levy taxes to provide the money. By your action on this bill you decide whether we must increase taxes or whether we may lower them. To reduce taxes you must first reduce expenditures. I hope the Members will have this in mind when amendments are offered to increase items in this bill.

This bill is the composite product of the work of 45 men, and a dozen subcommittees, with the most efficient staff ever mobilized on appropriations. I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the 12 chairmen and the members of their committees who wrote this bill, whose names appear at the head of each section of the report.

I might say equal credit is due members on both sides of the table, and here in the House, to Members on both sides of the aisle. This is not a political bill. The unanimity with which every subcommittee reported the respective chapters of the bill, with possibly one or two exceptions, indicates the unity of purpose and the hearty cooperation of all members of the subcommittees, regardless of party affiliation, and the care and dili-

gence with which they have worked to bring out the best bill possible. They have worked indefatigably since the beginning of the session. They have held long and exhaustive hearings, considering budget estimates, analyzing the justifications, examining the representatives of spending agencies, and all others who desired to be heard. And the chapters are carried in the bill before you represent their considered and, with few exceptions, their unanimous judgment. I want to take advantage of this opportunity to call to the attention of the Congress and the country their industry and patient cooperation in presenting here what they collectively consider the best bill which can be written under current limitations. The various chapters are incorporated in the bill just as the subcommittees wrote them without change or modification in any respect or in any particular.

The bill before you proposes appropriations in the total amount of \$27,266,403,664. Expenditures from that amount during the succeeding fiscal year are estimated to total \$23,423,832,918. Such expenditures will be augmented by expenditures from prior appropriations to the extent of \$7,079,776,516, making an expenditure total for the coming year 1951 of \$41,459,268,346.

The estimated receipts of the Government, as of March 15, 1950, as informally reviewed by the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation amount to \$37,300,000,000. The net result, therefore, indicates a deficit of \$4,159,268,346.

The committee has effected appropriation reductions by a total of \$1,385,377,504. Expressed in terms of expenditure, the reduction is \$979,489,060.

A notable feature of the bill is the reduction of appropriations for 1951 below the appropriations for the current year. Heretofore, the budget estimates have been the criterion by which we judged the degree of retrenchment. The subcommittees were urged to keep the appropriations below the estimates, but, in formulating this bill the appropriations for the current year were made the target, and subcommittees were urged to keep appropriations under those of the fiscal year 1950, a new objective in appropriations, and with such success that the pending bill is not only \$1,385,377,504 below the 1951 estimates, but it is \$832,014,180 below the 1950 appropriations.

But this is not the full measure of the economies effected by the bill. To this saving must be added the new obligations incurred by mandatory legislation, enacted in the last session of Congress. By passing fifteen different pay and travel acts, by increasing Federal Security, Veterans' Administration, Fair Labor Standards obligations of the Government, and other laws requiring direct appropriations and contract authority involving increases in expenditures, the Congress has arbitrarily increased the mandatory appropriations, above what we had to provide last year, \$2,350,700,000, statutory requirements over which the Committee on Appropriations has no option or control. When this sum is added to the amount this bill cuts from the 1950 appropriations, it will be seen that the

pending bill is \$3,182,714,180 less than the amounts carried in the annual appropriation bill for 1950, a record never before equaled in the fiscal history of the Republic.

But even with these exceptional savings, the bill is still \$4,159,268,346 in excess of the national revenues for the fiscal year, and there is a natural desire throughout the country for a balanced budget. The country demands that we keep appropriations within the revenues and that is a very natural and timely request of the Congress.

This, however, is not a peacetime budget; the country is at war, both technically and in fact. No treaty of peace has been signed. Although we have made every effort and every possible concession to bring about a formal agreement for the usual treaty marking the close of hostilities, a treaty of peace is as far away today, if not farther, than it was in 1945, 5 years ago, when the last gun was fired. We have no choice, therefore, except to maintain an alert state of preparedness, a readiness for any eventuality; and we are actually spending every day in this cold war more than we spent per day in the Civil War, in the Spanish-American War, and in the First World War combined. If permanent peace were assured; if there were no threats of attack and invasion from abroad, we could balance the budget very easily; we could cut taxes in half; we could make substantial reductions in the national debt; but, paraphrasing a very famous statesman: "Gentlemen cry Peace! Peace! when there is no peace. The next gale that sweeps from the north may bring to our ears the clash of resounding arms." This is a war budget, and no war budget was ever balanced by this or any other nation. We cannot balance this budget. It would be the height of folly to attempt it under present international conditions. But while we cannot economize at the expense of national safety and national defense, we can and we must make corresponding reductions in reducible domestic expenditures.

The acid test in passing on demands for domestic expenditures is not whether the money would be well spent—the invariable plea for every sort of appropriation and authorization offered on this floor—the test is not whether the money will be well spent, whether there is need for the expenditure. The question in this national crisis is: Can we do without it? And if that question can be answered in the affirmative on any proposal for expenditure here, the proposal should be rejected. That is the only thing to be considered in writing or amending this bill: Can we dispense with the appropriation under consideration either temporarily or permanently? If we can, it has no place in this bill; if it is in the bill it ought to be taken out.

Mr. Chairman, a circular letter has been issued by an organization registered under the Antilobby Act, known as the Council of State Chambers of Commerce, in which it is charged that this bill was "poorly and hurriedly drawn." In view of the fact that the circular letter has been sent to all Members of Congress

and distributed to the press let us examine into the facts, if any, supporting this statement. Is there any basis for such statement? This bill was written by the same men who wrote these reports last year. We had the same subchairmen this year we had last year. We had the same committee personnel this year we had last year and the same committee staff and there was no such charge last year. The men who wrote this bill, the chairmen of these subcommittees, are all able and experienced men. They have served here for many years. They have been very carefully screened before they were assigned to the Committee on Appropriations, and the committee screened them even more carefully. I think you cannot find in the House men better prepared and better qualified to write this bill. Why should men with more experience and a better knowledge of the subject this year write a poorer bill this year than last year? Why, it is absurd. The charge is made with deliberate propaganda intent and is without any basis of fact whatever.

Then this circular says the bill and report were hurriedly done. Last year was organization year. We were late in getting started. We started our first hearings on January 26. But this year, with organization intact, we began hearings on January 5. What is hurried about that, Mr. Chairman? Nobody suggested that last year the bill was hurriedly prepared. The truth about the matter is we have given more time to the hearings than usual. We have heard more people than heretofore. Not only were all subcommittees in session longer but the whole committee met to consider this bill on Monday morning at 10 o'clock, prepared to give 4 days to the reports from subcommittees. We announced we would begin Monday morning and report the bill Thursday night.

But the subcommittees had so thoroughly processed the bill and there was such general agreement on both sides of the table in the subcommittees that when we met no one had any amendments to offer.

On each chapter, in turn, the chairman and the ranking minority member of the committee reporting the chapter were called upon. There was no limitation placed upon time. They were free to talk as long as they liked and any other member of the committee who desired time was recognized.

After debate was concluded and there was no one asking to be recognized, the question was asked on each chapter: Is there anyone who desires to offer any amendment at any point in this chapter? And we did not leave the chapter as long as anyone desired to offer amendments.

Mr. Chairman, what is hurried about that?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The gentleman said there were no amendments offered. They were a few, very few I admit.

Mr. CANNON. I accept the gentleman's statement.

Mr. CANFIELD. I offered one, too.

Mr. CANNON. I did not say no amendments were offered. I said that the chapter remained open as long as anyone desired to offer amendments.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. The gentleman recalls I offered an amendment and it was for the rescission of funds heretofore appropriated, a rescission which we should have adopted.

Mr. CANNON. That is not in contravention of what I said. I did not say no amendments were offered. I said that no chapter was closed as long as anyone desired to offer an amendment.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman just said that there were no amendments offered.

Mr. CANNON. No; I did not say that. I said that no chapter was closed as long as anyone desired to offer an amendment.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman said that afterwards. Will the gentleman permit the reporter to read his words back?

Mr. CANNON. May I ask the gentleman, if he desired to offer an amendment anywhere in the bill which he was not given an opportunity to offer?

Mr. JENSEN. Absolutely. But, the gentleman said that no amendments were offered, and I offered three of them. If the gentleman will permit the reporter to read back his language, he will find that he said no amendments were offered.

Mr. CANNON. I am not certain whether I made that statement or did not make the statement, but whether it was made or not made is wholly inconsequential. The question here is, Was the bill considered hurriedly? Was anyone denied an opportunity to debate or amend this bill anywhere? I now submit that question to anybody on the floor. Did anybody desire to offer an amendment which he did not have an opportunity to offer?

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Would the distinguished gentleman from Missouri ask the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], which amendment he claims to have offered which he was not given the opportunity to offer in the full committee?

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman knows I did not make any such statement.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman made the statement just now when he said "absolutely" in answer to a question of the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JENSEN. I did not say the gentleman did not give me a chance to offer an amendment.

Mr. ROONEY. I want the RECORD to be straight on this, because no amendment sought to be offered in the full Appropriations Committee was refused consideration by the chairman of the committee. That is the record.

Mr. JENSEN. All right. Now, the gentleman from Missouri's—the chairman of the full committee—first statement was that no amendments were offered. Finally the gentleman from New Mexico rose and corrected him, and he said he stood corrected, and if you will take the time to let the reporter read the words of the gentleman from Missouri I will leave it to the House.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman is now graciously admitting that no amendment offered by him was refused consideration. Is that not the fact?

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman from Missouri said that after the gentleman from New Mexico had called his hand.

Mr. ROONEY. Well, let us say it now, I will ask the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. Say what?

Mr. ROONEY. Will the gentleman now admit that he was not refused consideration to offer any amendment?

Mr. JENSEN. Why, I never contended that I had been refused.

Mr. ROONEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. I think the record should show that so far as the Federal Security Agency and the Labor Department sections of this bill are concerned, that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] who was in charge of the bill as chairman of the subcommittee, made a statement of about a minute and a half before the full committee, and the gentleman from Wisconsin made no statement with respect to that bill before the full committee and indicated in a statement to the full committee that he reserved the right to make a statement on the floor and to offer amendments on the floor; is that not true?

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman's statement is wholly beside the point.

Mr. KEEFE. As usual.

Mr. CANNON. The statement was made there that the consideration of this bill was hurried. Now, I ask if there is anyone who can give any instance at any time, anywhere, in the subcommittee, or in the full committee, where he was not afforded an opportunity to talk if he wished to talk, to debate if he wished to debate, or to offer an amendment if he wished to offer an amendment.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman also make that statement regarding the first committee meeting of the first session of the Eighty-first Congress when he presided; when there were several amendments offered by your side of the aisle and the minority had amendments to offer, we stood up and tried our level best, the gentleman from New York and I did, to offer amendments, but got no recognition from the gentleman. He would not even look our way.

Mr. ROONEY. May I inquire if the gentleman from Iowa was present that day?

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman knows very well that I was present.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman is so anxious to get away from the point before the House.

Mr. JENSEN. If the gentleman will stay with the facts, I will not ask him questions.

Mr. CANNON. The charge is made here that consideration of this bill was hurried. I asked anyone here who desired at any time to interrogate a witness or to debate the bill or to offer an amendment if he was denied the opportunity to say so. And no one can cite any such instance. In other words, the charge is absolutely without foundation. If this bill was rammed through as they charge, where was it rammed through? When was it rammed through, and who rammed it through? The circular is a canard.

It throws a little light on this scurrilous letter when it is noted that the gentleman whose name is signed to it was particularly exuberant when the Eightieth Congress convened. Thirty or forty people from the outside had been brought down to investigate the Government. He was so enthusiastic that he gave an elaborate dinner for them at one of the famous hostelrys down town. I have not heard that he has provided a dinner for any of the Appropriations Committee or for any party fishermen in this session. In other words, this circular is pure propaganda. The bill was not hurriedly considered, and statements to that effect are without foundation of fact and for political effect.

He does grudgingly make one concession. He says, after about four pages of unsupported abuse:

The committee deserves credit for initiating the single or omnibus appropriation bill. This form of bill makes good sense to the layman. It enables him to see at a glance where over-all Federal spending policies and objectives are taking us.

In justice to the United States Chambers of Commerce, which might be erroneously confused with the organization distributing this circular, let me say that there is no relation between the two. On the contrary, the United States Chamber of Commerce in its daily letter, says:

A significant test of the willingness of the Congress to economize is before you in H. R. 7786, the first consolidated appropriation bill. The board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States realize the nature of the difficulties faced by the Committee on Appropriations. The board feels that the Committee on Appropriations has made a meritorious beginning. It recommends that the House employ its best endeavors to enforce further reduction in the measure under consideration.

The printed transcripts of the hearings on this bill were made available and distributed to the press and the members of the committee and the House and the public in general much earlier than ever before. Never before were the printed hearings available to the press and the public as early as this year. So everyone has had ample opportunity to familiarize himself with the proceedings of the committee as hearings progressed.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Is it not a fact that the press and radio have had a better opportunity, as a result of the way in which the hearings were released this year, to digest and report to the Republic on the items contained in the appropriation bill?

Mr. CANNON. That is true. There has been no previous instance in the history of the appropriation bills in which the proceedings of the committee were available so soon and in such detail.

However, it has had one untoward effect. As a result of this unrestricted publicity, the agencies affected, the organized groups of interest, and the professional lobbyists have been clamoring against practically every reduction in the estimates, and are even urging increases in the bill over and above the budget estimates. I think there is hardly a reduction made by the committee in this bill in the estimates in which there have not been some interested lobbies, somewhere, protesting against the reduction. Never before has there been such pressure on the committee and here in the House against savings recommended by the committee.

The press and radio over the country daily carry reports of amendments which they say will be offered to increase amounts throughout this bill. In view of these intemperate assaults on the bill and announced intentions of increasing it, when it is already over \$4,000,000,000 above the national income, I feel warranted in speaking a little more plainly than under other circumstances. The balance sheet of the Nation is anything but favorable. As a matter of fact if the United States were a private enterprise, any bank cashier or any man in the country would refuse to lend the Government another dime—if he did not bring proceedings to throw it into bankruptcy. The expenditures for the current year, and for the coming year are billions of dollars in excess of the national income. We carry a staggering public debt, unparalleled in history, of more than a quarter of a trillion dollars, a sum so large as to be utterly incomprehensible to the finite mind of man. And we are increasing it by huge sums every year. Why, the interest on the public debt alone is more than all the expenditures of the Government for all purposes in 1933. At the same time—and this is one of the alarming features—our national income is decreasing. Collections of Federal excise taxes dropped more than 12 percent in February as compared with the corresponding month a year ago.

From the start of the fiscal year July 1 to March 1, which is the latest figure available, collections totaled \$25,101,625,577, or a drop in national income of \$657,676,007 from the corresponding figure of last year.

Corporation income-tax payments for the first 8 months of the fiscal year totaled \$17,933,807,743, or a decline of \$480,114,129 for the same period a year ago.

Totals on income-tax payments up to March 15 are not yet available. But the

press carries forecasts of a drop in revenues variously estimated at something between a billion and a billion and a half dollars below the message estimates—money we thought we were going to get when we were projecting our fiscal program for the coming year last January.

It is said to be anywhere from a billion to a billion and a half dollars below what we anticipated. There seems to be general agreement that the revenue cannot, under most favorable circumstances, be less than three-quarters of a billion below the January figure. In addition to this steady and drastic decline in revenues, it is now proposed to reduce excise taxes. We are told a bill is on the drafting board which will reduce the Federal income from this source in an amount approximately a billion dollars annually. I am not discussing the merits of tax reduction or the merits of discontinuing excise taxes, but I do say that when you figure the financial picture and the fiscal status of the Government, not only is the national income from every source declining, but it is now proposed to further reduce it by reducing the taxes which are already bringing in an inadequate amount to take care of the appropriations carried in this bill. In short, we are carrying a national debt so vast that no one can predict when it will be paid. So acute is the situation that unforeseen national catastrophe might mean repudiation. How are we to pay it, when at the most prosperous time in the history of the Nation, with wages higher than ever before, with business paying larger dividends than ever before, with people generally more prosperous than they ever have been, instead of decreasing the debt, we are increasing it. When can we expect to pay it?

I want to appeal to the House not to increase this bill. A single increase in any item would be an unfortunate precedent. May I plead with the Members of the House to close ranks and oppose any increase anywhere in any item in this bill.

To be continually living beyond our means indicates not only a deplorable lack of business acumen, but a still more deplorable lack of moral fiber and stamina; a state of irresponsibility characteristic of the aborigine, consuming tomorrow's food today, without thought of the consequences.

I realize the strong appeal of amendments to increase appropriations for national defense. Nothing could be more important than adequate protection of the Nation. That takes first priority. But the best national defense lies in national solvency. You cannot win a war without money. You cannot avoid a war without money. Insolvency invites attack, and it is more important to avoid a war than to win a war. We must stay solvent, as well as strong in armament and in military might. The two go together. We cannot attain national security by bankrupting the country.

In this connection, let me say that there is always the possibility that we can be stronger with less expenditure for armaments than we are making today. It has been claimed by some of our critics, and I submit it for the consideration of the House when they take

up the study of this bill, that there is more waste in the 71 percent of the bill devoted to war, past wars, and future, than anywhere else in the bill. Whether that is true would have to be demonstrated. I do not vouch for such statement, but I do say that there is always a possibility that a better allocation of the money provided in the bill may contribute to the solution of the problem of adequate defense.

On the other hand, there are those who insist that there should be still further reductions in the budget estimates and that the bill should be amended, in detail and as a whole, to reduce the amount of the appropriations carried in the bill, to reduce expenditures for the fiscal year 1951. With this school of thought I take no issue. If there are items in the bill which can be reduced without reducing provisions for any service below the minimum actually required, it should be reduced. Let them take it up on this floor.

But, I do take issue emphatically, however, with all proposals for blind, blanket cuts; on any proposal for a percentage cut in the bill or a cross section cut in the bill. If such amendments should be agreed to, provisions must be made for effecting such cuts. Either the responsibility for allocation of such reductions must be delegated to the President or the bill must be recommended to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions. The latter is impractical. The several chapters of the bill vary in susceptibility to reduction. Some provide for services less imperative than others. Some for services which could not be cut at all if the Government is to continue to function effectively. There is no logical method of determining the respective percentage to be taken from the several respective chapters on a percentage or lump-sum reductions. On the other hand to delegate to the President the authority to allocate the reductions would be for Congress and the legislative branch of the Government to abdicate and transfer its constitutional powers to the executive branch of the Government which is in contravention of every tenet of the Constitution which specifically provides that the representatives of the people in Congress assembled shall control the purse strings of the Nation. To attempt to provide otherwise is subversive of the basic principles on which our Government is founded.

Let me say again, Mr. Chairman, that I favor cutting this bill where it can be consistently shown it can be cut; where it can be constructively reduced without injury to the service.

I am more concerned with amendments which propose to increase the bill than with amendments that seek to reduce the bill. We must conserve every dollar, every penny. In this national emergency we cannot afford to waste one dime. Our principal trouble today is debt. We cannot cure it by more debt. Deficit spending does not remedy anything. It merely postpones the inevitable reckoning to a less propitious date, to a more evil day. The longer postponed, the greater the escapable evil, snowballing, mushrooming, and skyrocketing with every passing hour.

I trust the committee will have the cooperation of Members on both sides of the aisle in passing a bill which will secure maximum results with the least possible expenditure.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 55 minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY].

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Chairman, for the last time I rise as a Member of the House to address the Chair and my colleagues. I dislike farewells, but for the past several days I have devoted a good bit of thought to just what I should say at this moment. I thought of stating my views on such ponderous and complex themes as world conditions, the H-bomb, taxes, tariffs, and the farm program. I thought of pointing with pride and viewing with alarm. But finally, I concluded, that after all, my views on these problems were not of such great importance or consequence because my votes on these and other matters are a thing of the past. They have been recorded.

On many, many occasions, Mr. Chairman, during the past 10 years, I have felt discouraged. I have, on those depressing occasions, and especially during those grave wartime days, thought that I would be happy to see the day come when I would leave this service. But strangely enough, when the time has actually arrived to leave the House, those memories have faded, and in their stead I remember only the most pleasant associations I have had with each of you.

This job has been most fascinating. The associations made, the genuine fellowships enjoyed, and the pleasure derived from rendering public service have all added to the extreme sense of satisfaction I feel. I am and have always been most grateful for the confidence placed in me by my people back home and by my colleagues. I have been given every consideration and cooperation from men on both sides of the aisle and in turn have tried to extend the same to all of you.

It seems to me that the problems of a Congressman have developed more rapidly in the past 10 years than ever before. Before I became a Member of this body, I thought about all my Congressman had to do was answer that letter I wrote him in regard to a rural route or post-office application. It did not occur to me then that perhaps thousands of other constituents were also writing him about something equally or perhaps more important. The Congressman of today is looked to for practically everything under the sun. He must have knowledge of taxes, tariffs, farm problems, military needs, human rights, business and labor legislation, in addition to scientific information on guided missiles and sonic devices. We are well aware that many men spend their lives studying a single subject whereas Members of Congress must be somewhat of an authority on all these, and many more when they are called upon to vote on the measure involved. In my opinion, it is virtually impossible for the average Member to be as well informed on these and a score of other matters as he would like to be. The

reason for that is simply because there are not enough hours in the day to discharge the multitude of demands made upon us and still devote the desired time to legislative measures before the House. Certainly I have found that to be true. While the recent reorganization bill was a step in the right direction it still is not the answer. The number of requests from the people will no doubt increase rather than decrease, as the years go on. If a Member meets those requests, he must necessarily have more help of the proper kind if he is to properly discharge his greater responsibilities as a voting Member.

Certainly no one among us has attained or is likely to attain any financial security through his pay as a Congressman. I also know that from my own experience. While the pay scale sounds big to the people back home, it is difficult for them to realize the extraordinary demands constantly made upon men in public life which are never made upon those in private life, not to mention campaign expenses. We all have known men who have made great personal sacrifices to remain in the House—some have come here strong in health and comfortable of purse and dedicated themselves to this service. We have seen their savings fade away to such a point that when the end has come, their survivors had nothing but the anticipated death benefit granted by Congress. While the responsibilities of this office cannot be measured in dollars and cents, I do feel that greater remuneration would at least in some degree compensate for the responsibilities involved. In my opinion, the time is fast approaching, if indeed it is not already here, when only those with independent means can afford to serve in the Congress. As I see it, such a result would be the very antithesis of democracy.

And so, Mr. Speaker RAYBURN, in conclusion I would like to express my deep appreciation to you, not only as one of the ablest servants this country has ever known, but also as a friend who has never been too busy to give of his sound and generous counsel; to my colleagues in the Texas delegation; to the distinguished majority leader, JOHN MCCORMACK; to the majority whip, PERCY PRIEST, with whom I entered Congress; to my fellow Democrats; to the able leadership on the Republican side of the aisle, Minority Leader JOE MARTIN, to CHARLEY HALLECK and LES ARENDS, and all the other Members of the Republican Party; to Lew Deschler and to the staff and employees of the House, whose diligence makes our tasks easier; to the members of my committee with whom I have enjoyed working; to the personnel in my office, without whose loyalty and help I could never have properly served my constituency, and to the people of the Eighteenth Congressional District, who have placed their trust in me, I am deeply grateful. The votes of confidence from them have made it possible for me to serve them and my country to the best of my ability and to serve with you, which has been the greatest honor of my life. I have never known a more conscientious, harder working, or finer group of people. So long as

the people of this country send such representation to Congress I have no fear for our democratic processes and institutions. God bless you all.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, Judge WORLEY is now leaving the House. He is leaving a host of friends on both sides of the aisle. I doubt if within my memory we have had the pleasure of serving with a more popular Member than he.

He has a distinguished legislative record. We all know that. He has rendered outstanding service to the people of his great district and to the people of the entire Nation.

Judge WORLEY, we wish you the best of everything. We know that you will have a great judicial record. May the Lord bless you and always take good care of you. We hate to see you go, but we are still with you in spirit and in feeling.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the district which Mr. WORLEY represents once included the district I represent. We have worked closely together through the years. I rise to join the chairman of the Texas delegation [Mr. THOMAS] in paying a word of tribute to our friend who is retiring from this body. He has performed a great service to the Nation and to the people of our State.

His record reflects credit upon his family, his friends, his district, and the Nation. He is made of the right kind of material. He is typically Texan all the way through, to the very marrow of his bones. He carries with him to this high post on the court an innate and unflinching sense of fairness which will serve the Nation well in the days to come.

Mr. Chairman, I could not refrain from paying this tribute to my close personal friend and to one of the most popular men, as our colleague from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] has said, who has ever served here in the House of Representatives in my time.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. Chairman, I am filled with conflicting emotions at this moment as we say farewell to our colleague GENE WORLEY. I am supremely happy that he is to go on the important bench of the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals and I also feel a note of sadness realizing that we are not to have the benefit of his services in the Congress after today.

May I say that I became acquainted with Mr. WORLEY early in his congressional career due to the fact that I have a number of friends living at Amarillo, Tex., who are likewise close friends of Judge WORLEY. It fell to our lot to be conferees, representing the House, in one of the most difficult problems and sharpest controversies that I have experienced

in 12 years in Congress. The other body and the House were in sharp disagreement in 1944 over legislation for a soldier voting plan, and for weeks the House and Senate conferees met daily in a long-drawn-out effort to reconcile our differences. In the end a compromise was agreed upon and approved by both bodies that I think was fairly satisfactory. When one serves for many weeks wrestling with a difficult problem he becomes well acquainted with his fellow conferees and he learns of their character. GENE WORLEY is a man of noble character. I was with him when this Government sent a delegation, appointed by the President, by the President pro tempore of the Senate, and by the Speaker of the House, to assist in launching the new government of the Republic of the Philippines. I doubt if anyone in Congress has had more intimate relations with GENE WORLEY than have I, and I think I can say truly that he personifies the soul of honor. He will make a fine member of the court along with our former colleague Judge Noble Johnson, and with my very good and close friend and splendid public servant, Judge Ambrose O'Connell. Probably no one in Congress is more intimately acquainted with Judge O'Connell than I am since he grew up in Iowa only a short distance from my home.

Judge WORLEY has gone up in the world because of his own ability, and I predict that he will go even higher. I am truly happy over his elevation to the judgeship and yet there is a lingering note of sadness that he will not be with us again.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. I should also like to join with our distinguished colleagues from Texas, and the other Members of this body in paying a well-deserved and high tribute to our friend GENE WORLEY, who is leaving the Congress, and going to the bench, entering what I am sure will be another distinguished career.

He and I, with other colleagues, came here at the same time in the Seventy-seventh Congress. I have had the very great pleasure of intimate and personal association with him, resulting in warm and lasting friendships. He has demonstrated great character and ability and served his country well. As he has served here in Congress I know he will continue to serve well his country on the bench. Judge WORLEY, as you leave us and enter your new career on the bench, I wish you continued success and good luck.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. FOGARTY. I, too, want to add my small word of tribute this afternoon to our esteemed colleague, GENE WORLEY of Texas. I, too, came to the Congress in January of 1941 with him. I have found him to be one of the outstanding Members of the House for the past 10 years, and although I am sorry to see him go, I know he is going into a job for which he is well qualified. He is deserving of the security which the job he is

going to promises for himself and his family.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I also came to the Congress with GENE WORLEY. It was not very long after that Congress was in session in January 1941, that I came to appreciate the earnest seriousness with which GENE WORLEY approached the work of legislating in this body.

You may recall that in February of 1941 we had the original lend-lease bill before the House. At that time both of us being freshmen, GENE and I were sitting back somewhat bewildered but attempting in our own way to study that bill, and to appreciate some of the significance of the step we were about to take in international affairs. From that very moment I have appreciated the counsel and assistance in my legislative work which I have always received from GENE WORLEY. Certainly we shall miss him greatly in this body. I am sure he has the good wishes of every Member on both sides for his continued success in the judicial post which he soon will assume.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. In order that there may be some expression from the minority members of this body, I take this opportunity to rise to join with the others who have expressed their gratification for the distinction which has come to our colleague.

Having served with him for over 10 years, those of us who have been associated with him know the quality of mind he has and the character that he possesses. We feel honored to think that he has been selected for this position of great responsibility.

As a matter of fact, it is my observation that men who are appointed to public office, whether judicial or administrative in the executive department, if they have served a period of apprenticeship as Members of this body, perform the responsibility of their office with a degree of far greater capacity, success, and effectiveness than those who were appointed from other fields of endeavor.

I am sure I speak the sentiment of every member of the minority party in wishing—I still, out of habit, will call him Representative GENE WORLEY, even though we may call him Judge—but to wish for him the very best of success in his new endeavor. It must be a matter of great pride and satisfaction to him to realize, as he must, that he takes with him the close affection and great admiration of his colleagues for that is the testimonial of a decade of constant, conscientious, and constructive public service.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, as a youngster in my teens I heard a little

poem that I think just fits the great character and sunny disposition of our very dear friend, GENE WORLEY. Fact is, the author must have had Genial GENE in mind as he penned these lines:

Making friends is a lot of fun,
Shaking hands with everyone;
Hearing what each has to say
As we meet them day by day.
Swapping smiles and trading cheer
Makes us happy while we're here
'Cause all the joy of life depends
Just on the art of making friends.

GENE WORLEY is a friend. He has been my friend. I know that he has been the friend of every Member of this body, regardless of his politics. In addition, GENE is a gentleman of the old Chesterfield vintage—a man of splendid background and wide experience. He is well versed in the law and he has that judicial temperament so vitally necessary to make a good judge. GENE will give a sympathetic hearing and an understanding heart to those who appear before him. The President is to be congratulated upon his wisdom in making this appointment, GENE, and the people of the great district he has so ably represented are to be congratulated upon this recognition. He will make a splendid jurist. GENE, in the words of the Book of Books, "May your leaf never wither and whatsoever you do, may it prosper." Good luck, and come back to see us when you can.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, all Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle will agree with me that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY] has proven himself one of the finest, most conscientious Members of Congress. Coming from a district just across the line from my State, I made his acquaintance very early during my first term in 1943. Since then I have learned to love and admire him; his good wife and mine are close friends; and I am proud to call him a friend. We will miss him here, but we applaud his elevation to the judiciary which he richly deserves, and where because of his training and temperament he will serve with distinction. On this occasion I say to Judge WORLEY—

I touch my heart as the Easterners do;
May the love of Allah abide with you;
Wherever you come, wherever you go;
May the beautiful palms of Allah grow.
Through days of labor and nights of rest,
May the love of Allah keep you blest.
I touch my heart as the Easterners do;
May the love of Allah abide with you.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, it has been my distinct privilege and pleasure to serve on the Committee on Agriculture with Hon. GENE WORLEY, of Texas, for many years. I want to say that he has endeared himself with the membership of the committee by his attentiveness and devotion to his duty. His pleasing smile will be greatly missed when he assumes his new duties as a member of the judiciary. He is able,

he is friendly, he has a very fine record as a member of the Committee on Agriculture, and as a Member of this House.

I wish him Godspeed in his new work. Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I want to join with other Members who have paid this tribute to a splendid Member of the House of Representatives. I am sure that all would like to join in paying this tribute today to GENE WORLEY. He has been a very very able Member of Congress; a conscientious workman on the Committee on Agriculture; but in paying tribute to him we cannot help but have feelings of sorrow at his leaving the House, although we are glad to know that his duties in his new position will keep him here in Washington. We know that he has a splendid record in the Congress; that he is possessed of a sterling character; that he understands the problems of people; that he is well informed in the law, and we can see that he will carry to the judiciary a basis for a sound and fine record which he leaves in this House.

We wish him the very best, and we know that GENE WORLEY will do his best to make his record there a splendid one, as he has made it here in this House.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RAYBURN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Mr. RAYBURN. I would not take a moment except for the fact that ever since I have known GENE WORLEY there has been a deep attachment between us. For himself alone, I can say that I have not seen a man, a young man, come to this House with more sterling qualities of character or more promise from the native ability that is his. If he had chose to stay here he could one day have been at the top, because he has character and a lovely personality and plenty of ability.

The thing that moved me closest to him, of course, was the fact that he came to my home town to choose his wife, a lady of great charm and ability. Her father and mother, Mr. and Mrs. Morgan Spivy, great people, still live there. She comes from the right kind of stock, and so does GENE WORLEY, because I know the families on both sides. GENE has now taken the name of Worley very high, and in my opinion will take it higher; but he and Ann have done me the honor to name a son, Sam Rayburn Worley, and the son will really cap the climax and do the job for the name.

EUGENE WORLEY A FINE REPRESENTATIVE

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to see my friend GENE WORLEY leave the House of Representatives. One of the most vivid impressions that I have of the Seventy-eighth Congress was the debate on the soldier vote bill.

GENE WORLEY was in charge of the bill. He was in a tough spot because there was a very violent disagreement as to what kind of a bill should be passed and the division was more pronounced in his party than in the minority party. His conduct at that time stamped him in my

mind as having a judicial temperament. He was scrupulously fair to the divergent groups and was considerate to those who differed with him. They were given as much time to present their views as those who agreed with the chairman of the committee.

Mr. WORLEY exemplified the tolerance and understanding that marks a good legislator as well as the good judge. He was a fine companion and it has been a privilege to come to know him as a competitor in our gymnasium and on the golf course. He has a happy and congenial family and in every way has measured up to the responsibilities of a father and a husband.

Though we have lost a good legislator I am glad that he will continue in the public service. He will prove to be a fine judge and I think the President is to be congratulated on appointing him. GENE WORLEY is a fine example of the opportunity that Congress offers to its Members of making lasting friends. All I hope is that my friend will continue to enjoy good health, as that is all he needs to make a fine record on the bench.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to join with my colleagues in paying tribute today to Congressman EUGENE WORLEY.

While I have not had the privilege of serving in this body with GENE for as many years as some of you have had, I have had the genuine pleasure of being his close personal friend for many years. GENE and I were classmates in the University of Texas, both of us having received our legal education in the Law School of that great university. It was there that I also came to know his fine wife, Ann, prior to the time that GENE was fortunate enough to persuade her to marry him.

Later on, it was my privilege to join him in the Texas Legislature when he had already completed one term in the house of representatives of that legislature. The two of us had the opportunity of serving together two terms in that body at the end of which he was chosen by his neighbors and friends to represent them further here. Both of us served in the Navy during World War II. It was, of course, a high privilege for me to join him again here last year.

As those of you who know GENE have found, he is a generous and loyal friend. While I regret to lose the benefit of his association and counsel here, I am happy for him and his wonderful family that he has been chosen for a position of great trust and responsibility. I have no doubt that EUGENE WORLEY will make a great jurist and will reflect credit on his country.

As he leaves here, all of us wish for him and his family the best in life.

Mr. H. CARLANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Ninety-one Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 130]

Allen, Ill.	Hand	Patman
Allen, La.	Hart	Pfeiffer,
Angell	Hays, Ohio	Joseph L.
Barden	Hébert	Pfeiffer,
Barrett, Pa.	Heffernan	William L.
Battle	Heller	Philbin
Bennett, Fla.	Herlong	Powell
Bentsen	Herter	Rains
Biemiller	Hinshaw	Redden
Blatnik	Hobbs	Reed, Ill.
Bonner	Hoffman, Ill.	Reed, N. Y.
Bosone	Hollifield	Ribicoff
Boykin	Hull	Richards
Buchanan	Jackson, Calif.	Rivers
Buckley, Ill.	Javits	Roosevelt
Buckley, N. Y.	Kee	Sabath
Bulwinkle	Kelly, N. Y.	Sadowski
Burke	Keogh	St. George
Byrne, N. Y.	King	Sasscer
Carlyle	Kirwan	Scott,
Case, S. Dak.	Kunkel	Hugh D., Jr.
Celler	Lane	Shelley
Cheesney	Lanham	Short
Chudoff	Latham	Sims
Clemente	Lesinski	Smathers
Combs	Lichtenwalter	Smith, Ohio
Coudert	Linehan	Smith, Va.
Davenport	Lucas	Sutton
Dawson	Lyle	Taylor
Dingell	Lynch	Teague
Donohue	McCarthy	Towe
Douglas	McConnell	Wagner
Doyle	McDonough	Walsh
Durham	McMillen, Ill.	Welch
Engle, Calif.	Mason	Wheeler
Fellows	Miles	Whitaker
Fisher	Miller, Md.	White, Idaho
Fogarty	Monroney	Wildnall
Frazier	Morgan	Willis
Gavin	Morton	Winstead
Gilmer	Multer	Withrow
Gordon	Murphy	Wolcott
Granahan	Nixon	Wolverton
Granger	Norton	Wood
Grant	O'Brien, Ill.	
Green	O'Brien, Mich.	
Hall,	O'Konski	
Leonard W.	Pace	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. KILDAY having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 7786, and finding itself without a quorum, he directed the roll to be called, when 295 Members answered to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks at the close of the remarks with reference to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this bill comes before the committee with direct appropriations out of the General Treasury of \$27,266,000,000, and with indirect or permanent appropriations, made in some other way than in this bill for the departments that are covered by it, of \$11,592,000,000. In other words, it provides that there will be taken out of the

Treasury of the United States \$38,859,000,000. It carries cuts in the direct appropriations of \$1,385,000,000. I will not at this time go into the total of those cuts; I intend to speak about that later. Some departments are cut as much as they should be; others are not. Generally through the bill, the items of administrative expenses are altogether too liberal, and there is too much provision for unnecessary personnel. I am thankful for the cut that has been made, but I want to see other cuts made and as the bill progresses and is read I hope to be able to point out different items where I believe savings can be made of very substantial amounts.

We were handicapped as we approached the consideration of this bill, first because of the fact that it was a new method of doing things and we were having the whole thing at once, all the items were to go in one bill. We were further handicapped by two new approaches to the fiscal affairs of the Government on the part of the Budget. The United States Code, section 582 of title 31, under "Money and Finance," provides:

There shall be submitted in the annual budget following every estimate for a general or lump-sum appropriation, except public buildings or public works constructed under contract, a statement showing in parallel columns first the number of persons, if any, intended to be employed, and the rates of compensation to each; and the amounts contemplated to be expended for each of any other objects or classes of expenditures specified or contemplated in the estimate shall include a statement of estimated unit cost of any construction work proposed to be done; and, second, the number of persons, if any, employed, and the rate of compensation paid each, and the amount expended for each other object or class of expenditures, and the actual unit cost of any construction work done out of the appropriation corresponding to the estimate so submitted during the completed fiscal year next preceding the period for which the estimate is submitted. Other notes shall not be submitted following an estimate embraced in the annual budget other than such as shall suggest changes in form or order of arrangement of estimates and appropriations and reasons for such changes.

Then there is another provision, title 5, section 674:

The estimates of expenditures and appropriations set forth in the budget to be transmitted by the President to the Congress on the first day of the next ensuing regular session shall conform to the classification herein provided, and the rates of salary and the compensation schedules shall not become effective until the first day of the fiscal year estimated for such budget.

That requires certain things in the nature of information to be furnished with the budget; in other words, I have here the budget for the fiscal year 1950. I turn to the heading "Secretary of Agriculture." We are given the details of all the employees in the form that has been known for years as green sheets. The budget deliberately failed to comply with the law in that it did not give us any of the information that the law requires and we need. Now all that is omitted, and the committee when it goes to work on these situations is unable to follow

the thing through in the way that it used to. In other words, we used to be able to tell by looking at the page in the budget just how many increases in salary had been made and just how the pay roll was made up. Now they came before us this year without any information such as that, and when you ask them for it and get it, it is given in a way that is entirely different from the way it had been given in the past. It was not full enough so that it would enable the committee to get at the picture of the employment in the different agencies of the Government as we used to. The failure to submit this information was, in my opinion, a direct and deliberate violation of the law on the part of the budget.

The minority as best it could tried to get that information where it might be available. Unless it is in the budget and available to the committee when witnesses first come before us it is absolutely impossible for the facts to be brought out so that we can catch these different agencies and bureaucrats on the things they have done, how they have used the hot money they have left the 1st of June to raise salaries, how they have used different items for the doing of various things that it was not contemplated should be done when the money was appropriated.

Then we have a performance budget against the project budget and that tends to cover the thing up a little more so that it makes it much more difficult for the Appropriations Committee to get at just what is involved and to keep track of what is going on.

I want to go over these bills a little bit in detail—I am not going to take a long time now—and call attention to a few facts that seem to me should be brought to your attention.

The legislative branch bill was cut moderately well. There are some items for administrative expenses that possibly can still be reduced. Frankly, I believe that almost everywhere the picture is about the same. The independent offices bill was cut probably a larger amount than any other bill. In a great many ways the items were very satisfactory.

There are a couple of items I wonder whether they are real savings or whether they are going to turn out to be ephemeral. There is one item for the Veterans' Administration. The amount provided for veterans' pensions amounts to about \$100,000,000. Those are not exact figures. I will not try to give them now. Another item for the veterans' training is about the same amount. But I do not know enough about that chapter and the justifications and all that sort of thing, so that I would want to say that was not an actual savings. But we have to pay whatever it figures out anyway, and most every year the Veterans' Administration comes back for more money.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. At this point in the Record I would like to ask the gentleman, and also the gentleman from Missouri, a question. In view of the letters

that Members of Congress are receiving with respect to action of the Veterans' Administration in the curtailment of hospital services alleged to be in process of curtailment, especially in the psychiatric end of hospitalization for veterans, can the gentleman state now whether or not the Committee on Appropriations has ever cut any request for those purposes that have been made either by the Bureau of the Budget or the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. TABER. Well now, I can say this with reference to the hospital picture: The Independent Offices Committee, when it brought in its report a year ago, carried a provision stating that they had not cut the funds necessary for the care of the sick and the disabled veterans 1 penny, and that they did not expect the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to contract his services at all. Now I will say this, that they gave the full amount asked for that purpose by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. I will say this that on two occasions since that appearance before the Independent Offices Committee the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs has been before the Committee on Appropriations: At one time he came before the Deficiency subcommittee, as I remember it, and another time before the Independent Offices Committee on a deficiency item. There was nothing in the deficiency estimates or nothing in the testimony of the Administrator with reference to any shortage of funds with reference to the hospitals that are provided for the care of veterans.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield to ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations a question? I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations if he concurs in the statement that has been made by the gentleman from New York with respect to the actions of the Committee on Appropriations in giving to the Veterans' Administration every dollar that was recommended by the Bureau of the Budget and the head of the Veterans' Administration for hospitalization purposes?

Mr. CANNON. Unfortunately I was in conference and I did not hear the statement of the gentleman, but from what the gentleman says I take it for granted that it related to curtailment of hospital services.

Mr. KEEFE. That is right.

Mr. CANNON. The bill does not cut the estimate for hospital services.

Mr. KEEFE. And the committee has not cut the hospital service?

Mr. CANNON. There is no retrenchment for hospital services.

Mr. KEEFE. I mean in the bill last year; not this year but last year.

Mr. CANNON. The committee never cut an appropriation for hospital service in any bill either this year or last year.

Mr. KEEFE. Then the record should be clear that the protests received as to the actions of the Veterans' Administration in curtailing services in hospitals to veterans is not the result of any action on the part of the Committee on Appropriations in failing to make funds available in an amount that represents their demands, or requests that have been

made to the Congress by the Bureau of the Budget or the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs for those services?

Mr. CANNON. I am not familiar with the correspondence which the gentleman has received, but I will say again that we have not cut the funds for hospital service in this bill or in any former bill.

Mr. KEEFE. I would like to get this clear because I know that many Members of Congress are receiving letters from all over the country with respect to this very situation, and I want to make it clear, if I can, in the Record. May I say to my friend from New York, that if there is any deficiency it does not result from any action that has been taken either by the Committee on Appropriations or action by the Congress itself in not providing every dollar of funds that has been requested.

Mr. RABAUT. Would it not be a little bit more orderly if we saw something of that letter? Nobody knows anything about it.

Mr. KEEFE. If the gentleman has not received the letter, he is one of the few Members of Congress who have not.

Mr. TABER. There was a statement, and I will repeat it, in the report of the Independent Offices Committee last year when their bill came in indicating that they had not cut the amount required to take care of the sick and disabled in the hospitals, that they had no intention of cutting it, and they expected the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to see that the funds were used for that purpose. That statement was right in the report. It is true also that in the bill we are now presenting there is no cut in the hospital picture.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. General Gray admits that he did not ask for this necessary money for the personnel in the hospitals. He admits that some mistake was made. I am reliably told that he is going to ask for more money. I think in a deficiency bill in the Senate, to provide more personnel for the hospitals. They have been cut too much, but it was not the fault of the Congress in any way, he has stated to me and to others.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Carrying on a little further the statement that was made about Veterans Administrator Gray, in the past 10 days the delegation from Kansas had occasion to talk to him about this very situation. During the course of that conference Administrator Gray admitted that any lack of service or personnel for veterans in our hospitals was not due to any shortcoming of Congress but was his own fault for not keeping his finger more closely on the funds granted him for fiscal 1950, which were \$566,666,400 for the care of these patients in our hospitals. That was exactly the amount he asked for, that was exactly the amount the House of Representatives gave him, and it was exactly what the Senate gave him, so that he knew at

least 19 months before exactly how much money he was going to have to care for the veterans in our hospitals during fiscal 1950.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I wonder if the gentleman can tell the House whether or not the item in the budget for fiscal 1950 to cover the 16,000 Veterans' Administration beds cut back by the President is in the 1951 budget now under consideration?

Mr. TABER. There has never been a time when the President could not have proceeded with the construction of those hospitals for which the funds were provided.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Do I correctly understand the gentleman to say, then, that the money is there but the President has not taken advantage of it?

Mr. TABER. That is so.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I know that in certain parts of Pennsylvania the hospital service has been drastically curtailed; in fact, it is quite critical. I have that from the highest source outside of the Administrator himself. What I should like to know is, does the gentleman from New York think the situation will be corrected so that this curtailment will not last any considerable length of time? This is a severe blow to the necessary services.

Mr. TABER. I will give the gentleman as good a picture of it as I can.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. I want to make this statement, because the answers that were given to the gentleman from Wisconsin just do not make sense. Within my district is Fort Snelling, the Twin Cities hospital. It has recently closed 200 beds and released 100 professional employees. Whose responsibility is that, ours or Gray's?

Mr. TABER. The only way the Congress has in any satisfactory manner, to find out how much money is required for the operation of these hospitals and for the proper care of the veterans is to get that information from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and his staff. I just want to say this: We do not have before us any budget estimate for the care of veterans in hospitals in the nature of a deficiency estimate at the present time. That is the reason I conferred with the clerk of the committee just now. I wanted to be sure I made that statement correctly.

If we are to proceed to do anything about any deficiency item we would naturally expect to have a budget estimate from the Department. It is almost impossible to handle that kind of a situation without that being made available to you. There is no deficiency bill in the other body at this time and there is none that the House has considered or had any hearings on. There are some

estimates, but none that have been marked "urgent" and none relating to the care of veterans in hospitals.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am reliably told that word has gone out to doctors and some of the other personnel in the hospitals to hold the cots in abeyance until a survey has been made. I understand that most of the survey has been made, and I am reliably told that General Gray will ask for a deficiency appropriation in order to cover the personnel back or keep them in the Veterans' Administration offices and hospitals.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. As recently as last week I made a personal check with the Bureau of the Budget and as of that time the Veterans' Administrator had not yet made any request of the Bureau of the Budget for any deficiency appropriation for the operation of hospitals for the fiscal year 1950.

Mr. TABER. I have checked as of today, and there is nothing of that kind hanging before the Congress at this time.

I will now go down through the items in the bill. With reference to the Department of Labor, I believe that administrative expenses there could be cut and should be cut. I believe they have more money than they need.

The Federal Security Agency, too, I think, has more money for administrative expenses than it needs.

The General Services Administration has more money than it needs, beyond doubt.

The Housing and Home Finance Agency has been cut some, but it could still stand more of a cut on the administrative expenses.

The Department of Agriculture has become in one way or another a very large agency. At the present time the direct and indirect appropriations of funds runs something like this, without the losses of the Commodity Credit Corporation, if any. There are \$764,000,000 in direct appropriations; \$126,000,000 in permanent appropriations; \$21,000,000 in trust funds; \$520,000,000 in loan authorizations; \$20,000,000 in operating expenses of the Commodity Credit Corporation; amounting in all to \$1,451,000,000. In addition to that there will be whatever losses the Commodity Credit Corporation reports and are certified by the Treasury Department indicating that we would have to make an appropriation to make that Corporation good.

If the losses on the 1st of July run up to a very large figure, the amount is likely to be for Agriculture something in the nature of \$2,500,000,000.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. VURSELL. The gentleman from New York has brought out that he believes there should be substantial reductions made in the administrative departments of the Government. To be practical about it, how can we get at it? Would it be possible to make a cut in

each department of the unnecessary employees over a certain amount, and leave it to the department to absorb this cut in the various departments? Everyone knows there is waste in government where politics comes in, and whether it is a Republican or a Democratic administration, the big bureaucracy has a heyday. It ought to be stopped somewhere along the line and in my judgment that is where we ought to come in. I do not know what is the proper approach but I think an approach should be made and it should be backed by the Members on both sides for economy in government.

Mr. TABER. Those who know best about where the savings can be accomplished are members of the subcommittees who have served on each bill. I hope that as these chapters are read, wherever there is an item of administrative expense or anything else that has not been cut fairly and sufficiently, that an effort will be made by someone to reduce it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

I hope that we will be able to cut the bill down.

I am not going to take much longer at this time, but just to show you how serious Federal expenditures are, the cost of the budget that we have before us and the incidents that go with it, will run in the neighborhood of forty-one or forty-two billion dollars. That means \$285 for each man, woman, and child in the United States. It means almost as much as the income of lots of these families, perhaps it means more than the income of lots of these families. When you get to that point you are at a point where the people of the United States must begin to wake up and to realize how much it means to them to see that the expenditures of the Government are kept within bounds and that we are able to come somewhere near balancing our budget and keeping the Nation right-side up.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. VURSELL. The gentleman has served on the Committee on Appropriations either as chairman or ranking minority member for many years. The question I wish to ask him is this: From the gentleman's long years of experience, taking into consideration that we are employing in the Federal department today about 2,000,000 people, does the gentleman believe that if we should cut out the useless and unnecessary employees in every department of the Government, we would be able to reduce this budget by a billion dollars and still not hurt the efficiency or the economy or the administration of the Government in any way?

Mr. TABER. The total personnel cost in this budget is right around \$7,000,000,000. In my opinion we could come very close to a billion dollars in reductions of personnel without in the slightest degree impairing the efficiency of the Government.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman from New York and also the gentleman from Missouri have been discussing the bad shape of our national finances. I presume the gentleman from New York noticed the item in the press either yesterday or this morning to the effect that the net-income returns are falling about \$1,000,000,000 less than anticipated by the administration; in other words, we are going to have a deficit in this fiscal year of at least \$6,000,000,000 rather than the \$5,000,000,000 many have assumed it would be. In the opinion of the gentleman from New York, would it not have been good business had that information been available last Friday when only 86 Members of this House, including the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Minnesota now speaking, saw fit to vote against that \$3,096,000,000 bill? If we do not vote against some of these expenditures, how are we ever going to balance the budget?

Mr. TABER. We are never going to balance the budget unless we make it our business to see that funds are not appropriated unless they are absolutely necessary to keep this country going.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. FORD. The gentleman is familiar with the legislation passed by the House and the Senate last session setting up the General Services Administration as recommended by the Hoover Commission. Can the gentleman tell me whether or not in fiscal year 1951 we are going to see material savings as the result of the passage of that legislation, savings promised to us by the Hoover Commission and the people who sponsored the legislation? And if so, can the gentleman refer me to information that will prove the point?

Mr. TABER. Frankly, it is set up here as \$361,000,000 appropriations. I cannot turn to the amount for last year, but my recollection is that the amount this year is larger than the amount made available last year.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. If the gentleman will yield I will give him the figures.

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The request was for \$300,000,000 more for this year than for last, but that is not quite a comparable figure, because in that figure there are items assigned to the General Services Administration which had not been assigned to the agencies which it took over.

Mr. FORD. Leaving aside those additional functions that have been given to General Services Administration, would the gentleman say there had been any saving?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. A money savings?

Mr. FORD. Yes.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. There has not been any money savings. The intention was to create the saving by proper administration of the supplies and the items that come under the new

agency and to believe that they will in the future produce a saving.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. May I say to the gentleman from Michigan that the Hoover Commission when created by the Congress was directed to do two specific and principal things. One was to find ways and means of obtaining greater economy in the conduct of our public affairs, and the other was to find ways and means of obtaining greater efficiency in the handling of those affairs. The Office of General Services was set up for two reasons, if I remember correctly. One was to give a better administration of various agencies of the Government and to put them into one organization as it were, and the other was to relieve the President of some of the personal responsibilities that have been placed upon him as a result of the agencies being made independent under the law which are now in the Office of General Services, so that there will only be one man reporting to him instead of a dozen or so.

The study of the Hoover Commission, to the best of my memory, demonstrated that by the creation of the Office of General Services we would have more efficient and a better streamlined organization that would save a great deal of time for the President over a period of time if properly administered as planned and as recommended and should bring savings of about 20 percent on the previous cost of all of the various organizations that would be included under that office, bearing in mind, of course, that historically the Government continues to cost more and more and more. I hope we can reach the place where we may reverse that trend, but it has been the historic record of most requirements that it is pretty difficult over a long period of years to cut the cost of that particular department of Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I hope that explains the situation as I see it to the gentleman. I am not sure that there are savings reflected by this appropriation bill, but I believe the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from California are correct. It is rather difficult to get an accurate view of it at this time because all of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission which surrounded the Office of General Services have not been put into effect as yet.

Mr. FORD. It is not the fault of the Congress those recommendations have not been put into effect.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I agree with the gentleman, yet I must say that the Congress of necessity should give some leeway—some time—for this new organization to get into operation and under way.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Along the same line and in reference to this economy matter, is it not the purpose of plan 18 to transfer certain employees who have to do with Government buildings from, for example, the postal department over into General Services?

Mr. TABER. That is true.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Let us go one step further. There is also in contemplation at least the plan that when those postal employees go over into General Services they are going to take with them the higher rate of pay which the postal employees have over and above those employees who were in General Services. That is true, is it not?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Is the gentleman asking me or the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, anybody that knows the answer.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. There is some cut, but that is my understanding of it, because of the fact that they had held a higher pay rate.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And certain group advantages.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman asked me a question. Now let me answer.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, I am not going to listen to the gentleman take all week to do it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I do not think the gentleman controls the floor.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Here is the proposition—I do not care how much the gentleman talks, but here is what they propose to do. The postal employees have certain vested rights, they say, in pensions, retirement pay, or whatever it is, so when they go over into General Services they are going to be bracketed in there at the same rate of pay that they get in the postal service, which is higher than employees in the General Services are going to get for the same kind of work. Well, I can see the justice in giving those who go out of the Postal Department into General Services the same rate of pay when they move over there, but what I cannot see is this: General Services employees get a longer vacation with pay and sick leave than do the fellows in the postal service, so when the postal-service fellows go over they will not only take over their higher schedule of pay, but they will also get the advantage of the longer leave of the General Services. Do you not see it is heads I win and tails I lose? Now, there is no economy in that, and there is no use pretending there is.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I have just listened to the gentleman from Michigan and his speech, or dissertation, or whatever you want to call it—address or something of that sort. Of course, one of the arguments we have and one of the things you are up against is whether you are going to take away from the men in the custodial service of the Post Office Department the rates of pay that they now have, and as I understand this plan, as I understand the recommendation, it

is simply this: That in order that you do not continue that practice, where in many instances the custodial employees of the Post Office Department are receiving more compensation than the postmaster, who is responsible for the post office in which he works, that you should transfer all custodial services over into the Office of General Services, making one general supervision of custodial services. But you are transferring men now in the post-office service at the same rate of pay, and they will continue to receive that until someone else is appointed, and then they come in under a lower rate of pay to fill the vacancy as these men go. If the gentleman from Michigan would have his way, he would keep them all in the Post Office Department at the higher pay and never correct the inequities and inequalities that now exist, and all the Hoover Commission tried to do was to correct that situation.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Mention was made a few minutes ago of the bill that passed the House authorizing \$3,096,000,000 for various forms of foreign aid. Included in that is an amount for fiscal advisers for these foreign governments, and a number of the governments in the Marshall plan have come close to balancing their budget. I believe we were told in the hearings that Britain has balanced its budget.

Mr. TABER. They paid a billion dollars, pretty near, on their debt, as the result of what they have gotten from us.

Mr. VORYS. What I wanted to ask the gentleman was this: Since the subcommittee is studying here in more detail the \$15,500,000 for personnel for the ECA, does the gentleman know how much of that is being spent for advisers to tell these other countries how to balance their budgets?

Mr. TABER. There is a very considerable amount that is being spent for advisers, business advisers, and governmental advisers. Just exactly what the figure is I could not tell offhand. I do not have it in my head. We will have the detail of that when the item for the ECA and other activities comes up.

Mr. VORYS. Will the gentleman attempt to find out whether we could secure the services of any of those experts to advise us on how to balance our budget here?

Mr. TABER. I hope that would be better than they have been in other places.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. Can it not be said for the benefit of the gentleman from Michigan that Mr. Jess Larson, the Administrator of the General Services Administration, is at least taking an inventory, and he has recently discovered among other things that the Government has stock-piled fluorescent bulbs sufficient to last the Government for the next 100 years.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman has been very persuasive, I will say. He has per-

sued the Committee on Appropriations to recommend \$836,000,000 as against \$680,000,000 for the same activity last year. He must be a good man.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I wonder if the gentleman will comment on this new idea of bringing all appropriations here in a one-package bill?

Mr. TABER. I am afraid it takes away the sense of responsibility the individual subcommittees have to cut. Perhaps they will break in; perhaps they will get that same idea we tried to inspire in them 2 years ago and 3 years ago. But while there have been cuts here, they have not been as deep as I should like to see and they have not been as general as I should like to see them.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not possible to cover a lot of items with this one-package idea that the average Member of Congress cannot find time to study?

Mr. TABER. Frankly, it is harder for a Member of Congress to have the whole of it in one package than it is to have it in 10 or 12.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Is it not easier to see how much it is all going to cost under the package bill?

Mr. TABER. It is easier to see what the over-all governmental cost is. That cost runs about \$285 a head for every man, woman, and child in the United States.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a brief observation?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman from Ohio made a real contribution to this House when he mentioned that there was not going to be any wholesale cutting of the small-salaried people in the jobs of elevator operator, janitor, and other custodial jobs in any department. It seems to me when we start economizing we ought to begin in the upper brackets and cut some of the swivel-chair executives down there in the various departments. I cannot go along with trying to cut the little fellow.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

HOW SAFE IS AMERICA?

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to have this opportunity to address my fellow Members concerning certain of the many problems today confronting our country which is involved in a world-wide cold war with those whose ideologies are repugnant to our people who cherish our democratic way of life.

I ask this question: How safe is America?

After 2 months of hearings on the bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and also sitting in as a member of the Central Appropriations Committee re-

viewing the figures and reports of other subcommittees for all appropriations of Government during the next fiscal year, I cannot agree with the feelings of some of the Members that the United States is entirely safe in case an emergency should arise.

Let us look at some of the facts that were developed during our hearings.

Much has been said in the past and will be said in the future concerning our people in Government. I have been a Member of Congress some 16 years, and during that period of time I have found that the vast majority of our Government employees are sincere, loyal, and hard-working individuals. They feel the responsibility which is theirs and perform their appointed tasks diligently without thought of favor.

Two years ago our committee was able to bring to the attention of the Congress some security risks in the Department of State. As a result, Congress wrote a provision in the bill giving the Secretary of State the power to remove from service any employee who, in his opinion, was a menace to the safety of the United States.

Again, this year, during the hearings covering the Department of Commerce, the security situation gave our committee concern, with the result that a provision was written into the Commerce bill giving the Secretary of Commerce the same power to remove any employee, as had previously been given to the Secretary of State.

The Members of Congress may rest assured that our committee has carefully analyzed the problems of all agencies coming before it and has not hesitated to thoroughly look into any problem which would reflect against a strong and secure United States.

Apropos to my previous statement that I have faith in the loyalty of our hard-working Government employees, I want to point out that during Director Hoover's testimony before our committee in connection with the appropriation for the FBI, he pointed out that more than 2,000,000 loyalty forms had been processed by the FBI. From this number, field investigations were opened in 11,403 instances. Less than four-tenths of 1 percent of the employees submitting loyalty forms were subject to investigations. Our committee wholeheartedly agreed with Mr. Hoover in his statement that this program, which has resulted in cleaning out certain types of individuals in the Government service, is well worth while.

The undesirable Government employee who today is being rooted out is dangerous but not our greatest danger. I feel that a greater danger faces our country today from the activities of the subversives who are endeavoring by every means to overcome our present democratic way of life. We cannot afford to overlook the brutal truth that today we are involved in a cold war which threatens the very future of our Nation.

None are so blind as those who will not see that we must not be lulled into a false sense of security which would permit our enemies from within to accomplish what foreign aggressors from without have failed to do through the

tragedy of two great wars during our generation.

I am not Low nor have I been an alarmist. I do not wish to alarm or frighten our people against a nonexistent enemy. I do feel, however, that I would be remiss in my responsibility to the citizens of this Nation if I failed to bring to their attention the very real danger which we face today. I also feel that at the same time we should put on notice those elements who are opposed to our way of life that we are aware of their conniving treachery and that we are fully capable of maintaining and will maintain a free and democratic United States.

Let us look into the record of the hearings before our committee concerning the dangers facing us today.

Mr. Hoover, during his testimony, advised our committee that the work in the internal-security field has increased tremendously; that, as a matter of fact, it is heavier now than it was at the peak of World War II. The cessation of hostilities increased rather than decreased the investigative burdens in this particular field.

The orbit of Communist control has extended from one-seventh of the world's population in 1917 to one-third of the world's population at this time. We have seen country after country fall under control of this menace until, at the present time, the United States stands as the strongest bulwark against the expansion of this ideology on a world-wide basis.

This growth is reflected in our country today. Communists have intensified their program. Their underground activities have increased proportionately.

I ask again, How safe are we? Mr. Hoover pointed out to our committee that, allied with the Communist Party in its subversive activities are a number of infiltrated Communist-front groups and certain foreign-nationality groups which are a constant menace to our way of life. Certain foreign countries are endeavoring to infiltrate our country for the purpose of securing confidential information about secret operations to which they have no right.

Our committee was advised that investigations of such groups and individuals are of a continuing nature. It was pointed out that the experiences of World War II, which brought about the downfall of entire nations through fifth-column activities, did not occur overnight. Such activity develops over a long period of years.

This is the activity which is taking place in our country today. We must be ever alert to combat these tactics.

What is the extent of communism in our country today? Mr. Hoover advised us that the Communist Party of the United States, which follows the Moscow line for the overthrow of our Government by force and violence, has a membership of approximately 54,174 persons. They spread throughout the length and breadth of our land. They can be counted in every State in the Union. They are the problems of all who cherish our present way of life. Let us not be misled by the numerical strength alone of these traitors. They possess a

fanatic loyalty to their masters abroad. They have boasted that for every member of the party they have 10 willing and subservient stooges to carry on the program of the party. This means that our potential fifth column numbers approximately 540,000 persons who support the Communist philosophy.

Again, I say, be alert, be aware, and do not permit ourselves to nurture false hope that a real and pressing danger does not exist.

The Communists use every known artifice to gain their ends.

Those who are desirous of entering our country to carry on their nefarious plots find many avenues of approach open to them.

For example, during our hearings we were advised by representatives of the Immigration and Naturalization Service that there are an estimated three to three and one-half million aliens in our country today.

The justifications of the Immigration Service points out that large numbers of aliens and stowaways on vessels coming to the United States are successful in landing illegally in this country.

We were advised that such illegal entrants into our country constituted a major segment of the problem of the Immigration Service.

Further, I wish to point out that our borders, both to the north and to the south, are unfenced. It is known to all that the traffic across these borders is very heavy, making it possible for those having subversive inclinations to enter our country by these routes. Thousands of aliens enter our country illegally from Mexico. It was stated that it is simply impossible to guard the Rio Grande River in such a manner that persons could not illegally enter our country. During the fiscal year 1949 alone 289,400 persons who had entered our country illegally from Mexico were apprehended. The heavy traffic across our northern and southern borders makes possible illegal entry of those who may seek to destroy our democracy.

In connection with our displaced-persons program our committee was advised that even though investigations are conducted concerning these unfortunates some would get by the Immigration Service on forged documents, regardless of how meticulous the Immigration Service is in its investigative procedures. Advice had previously been received by the chairman of our committee from competent people connected with CIC and the IRO in Europe that the investigation of these people as to their subversive background is utterly ridiculous; that there is not a question of doubt but that one or thousands of them could come into this country who had been active members of the Communist Party behind the iron curtain.

Further, there are many aliens in our country today who have been determined to be undesirable and are subject to deportation but who cannot be deported, since it is impossible to secure travel documents for them. Many of these individuals are from the iron-curtain countries.

During our hearings, Mr. Kelly of the Immigration and Naturalization Service

stated that they had between 3,500 and 4,000 such cases at that time. These people, these undesirables, are free among our people today. They are not in detention quarters but are released either on bond or on parole. The Immigration and Naturalization Service has stated that they endeavor to keep them located; however, they are free to go where they please.

Of those under deportation still in our country, there are approximately 100 free on bond, who are subversives. It is a shameful travesty of justice that these subversives, faithful to a foreign ideology which would destroy our way of life are free to roam our country spewing their venom of hate for all to see and to hear. How safe are we when such events as these can and do occur in our everyday life?

Another group of aliens from eastern Europe arrived in this country en route to South American countries, for which they had secured visas. They appear to be people of considerable means.

They made no move to continue their passages, their visas expired, and the limited number of days which were granted to them by the Immigration Service also expired. They were released on bond and they report to the Immigration Service at stated periods. Our committee was advised that we now have these people on our hands whether we like it or not, and that there is a good possibility that they will not now be accepted by the South American countries to which they were destined.

Turning again to another phase of this matter, you know that under the Foreign Agents Registration Act those agencies and individuals representing foreign countries must register with the Department of Justice.

At the close of the last fiscal year every iron curtain country had agents registered under this law. It is interesting to note that Earl Browder, whose background is known to all, was registered as an agent of the Soviet Union.

These representatives are free to travel about our country at will. We can rest assured that our representatives in their countries have no such freedom of movement.

We ask ourselves, are there other such groups active throughout our country today? The answer is yes; the foreign intelligence services through their networks are exceedingly active. Their objectives are: Information on atomic research, radar, jet propulsion, guided missiles, the securing of topographical maps of our coastal lines, our airports and military landing fields, data on biological warfare, and our industrial and military resources, among others. These groups are ever alert to secure any and all data to be forwarded to their homelands. They are endeavoring day and night to secure our know-how and to find wherein we may be vulnerable.

Again I say, our enemies are ever alert. I wonder how many of my colleagues are aware of the fact that representatives of foreign embassies in Washington carefully scrutinize, review, and index every page of our appropriations hearings. This is a must, and they are among the first to secure copies

of the hearings so that they can keep currently abreast of developments in our various branches of Government activity. They do not let to chance the securing of information which may be of importance to their governments.

The many matters which I have mentioned here today are those which I feel are of paramount importance to each and every one of us. Too often we are lulled into complacency, feeling that no real danger is being faced by our country during these critical days. I have mentioned but a few of the facts secured through our hearings, which show that the danger from subversive forces is real.

I, for one, am thoroughly aware of the dangers we face during our present cold war. We must lend our every effort to continue a strong internal defense. We must be constantly alert to render ineffective the efforts of the subversives in our midst. We cannot be penny-wise and pound-foolish. Keeping strong our agency that bears the responsibility for our internal security, is the best insurance the people of the United States can buy.

It is for this reason that your committee has approved the full amount of the budget estimate submitted to the Congress for the activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Mr. Hoover, during the presentation of his testimony, pointed out that the increase in funds requested by his Bureau, if approved, would permit increased coverage of investigative matters in the internal security field.

He advised your committee that the Communist Party has increased its activities among front groups. It has revived its drive to expand the united front program. One of the great dangers of communism is the ability of its espousers to infiltrate and corrupt various spheres of American life.

The Communist Party has endeavored to exploit youths, veterans, civil rights, foreign nationality groups, educational and many other groups.

They have developed one of the greatest propaganda machines that civilization has ever known.

Mr. Hoover further advised your committee that in the light of developments during the past year, the Communist Party has become increasingly security conscious. They are developing an underground apparatus and are decentralizing their operations. This decentralization has almost tripled the number of Communist Party clubs.

These developments have made more difficult the continued coverage of party activities. Mr. Hoover feels that with the additional men requested, an increased coverage which he deems absolutely essential can be had.

Your committee has no hesitancy in reposing its faith in Mr. Hoover and the FBI.

All of us in this Chamber remember the dark days of the early thirties when no home appeared safe. During those days crime was rampant; the kidnaper was collecting tremendous sums from families whose loved ones had been kidnapped. The extortionist was waxing rich by playing his criminal activities; the bank robber became so bold that no bank-

er could be sure his institution would not be prey of these vultures.

In the face of this increasing criminal menace, a series of so-called crime bills were passed by Congress, the enforcement brunt falling upon the shoulders of Mr. Hoover and the men of the FBI.

They measured up to the task. Bank robbery and extortion became unprofitable pursuits. The kidnaper found that he was to spend his remaining days in prison. In only two kidnaping cases throughout the years has the FBI failed in solving the crime. These two are still under investigation.

Through the years which followed, additional tasks were assigned to the FBI and in every instance the job was well done. The back of the vicious criminal had been broken. Through the war period and up to the present time, the FBI, although having many additional duties assigned to it, has continued to investigate violations of the law without fear or favor.

When the war clouds gathered in the late thirties, the FBI was designated by the late President Roosevelt as the coordinating agency for the internal security of our country.

The manner in which Mr. Hoover and his staff performed their duties during that critical period is history.

The sneak attack on Pearl Harbor found the FBI prepared. Prior to that time, Mr. Hoover, fearing eventual war, had quietly compiled information on those whose ideologies were not those of our country so that at a moment's notice they could be taken into custody if the safety of our country was in jeopardy.

Immediately after Pearl Harbor, the men of the FBI took into custody some 16,000 potentially dangerous enemy aliens thereby removing the threat of sabotage in those critically dark days. Throughout the war period, the FBI continued its excellent work. A monument to its efficiency is the fact that there was not one single case of foreign-inspired sabotage during the entire war period. Foreign espionage rings were controlled—these spies ending up in our prisons. It can be told now that also during that critical period of our country's history, men of the FBI served with distinction throughout the Western Hemisphere.

During the cold war which has followed the shooting war, the FBI has continued to bear the coordinating responsibility for the internal security of our Nation.

Our committee has been advised of the developments of subversion in our country and of the steps taken by the FBI to overcome these activities. Mr. Hoover is acutely aware of the dangerous situation now confronting us and his every effort and resource are being expended to nullify the efforts of those who wish to destroy our way of life. He and his Bureau have been pilloried by the Communist and his stooges who have stopped at nothing in order to shake the country's faith in this organization. The charges of Gestapo, of secret police, and of national police have been voiced long and loud by many of those whose questionable activities have been uncovered by the FBI.

Those who know Mr. Hoover know how repugnant to him is a national police. He has long advocated against such a police. He has refused to be named the investigator, prosecutor, and judge, which would be a forerunner of a police state. He has stated publicly that his is the responsibility to secure the facts through impartial investigation and that the prosecution and judgment are for the prosecutor and the courts. We need never fear any abuse of power by Mr. Hoover and the FBI.

His service is a monument to a man's devotion to his countrymen and I, for one, feel a great sense of security knowing that the ever watchful FBI is guarding the internal security of our country.

I am sure you will agree with me that our danger today is real. There are many loopholes through which the subversive and his clan can enter our country for the purpose of corrupting our way of life. We must be vigilant. We must insure our continued internal security against these elements. Approval of the pending appropriation request for the FBI is a step in that direction. I so recommend its approval.

UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

Our hearings for appropriations for the Department of State contained considerable matter regarding the foreign policy of the United States Government. It was my privilege to ask a half a dozen witnesses from the Department of State to explain our foreign policy. One excellent explanation was given by Assistant Secretary Howland Sargeant and is already printed in the hearings, and I recommend the reading thereof.

However, since the hearings were held, I have had another explanation from Mr. Nelson T. Johnson of the Far Eastern Commission. I had previously discussed with Mr. Johnson the difficulty which seems to beset many people who try to define United States foreign policy. It is Mr. Johnson's thought that the constantly reiterated statement that the United States has no foreign policy is based upon a widely prevalent tendency to confuse policy with action. It is enlightening to note that Mr. Johnson and other members of the Department of State feel that the United States has pursued a very definite policy in its relation with the outside world. Mr. Johnson tells me that our policy is to promote and maintain by every means at our disposal the spiritual and material interests of the Nation and its people at home and abroad. Mr. Johnson's argument is that hundreds of individual and separate actions are taken every day by the United States Government pursuant to that policy. Such actions are taken by many agencies of the United States Government, chiefly, however by the Department of State which is the executive department principally charged with the field of foreign relations. It is the feeling of Mr. Johnson that while such actions must be in line with policy, they must be distinguished from policy.

On the subject of policy, Mr. Johnson tells me this policy is based upon certain principles which set forth our national ideals and desires in the field of foreign relations. He states that these prin-

ciples are important because they have been fed into the minds of our people by teachers, parents, and by their political leaders, and that it is at all times necessary when an agency of the United States Government takes action in the foreign field that it coordinate or align action with these principles. When action fails to conform to these well-known principles, the Government begins to hear at once from the people whose support it seeks, for these principles have now become a part of the national thinking in regard to how, when, and why Government should act at home and abroad to promote and maintain the Nation's spiritual and material interests.

Because of the great importance to our people who are confused as to what the foreign policy of the United States is today, it should be important to state that these principles are older than the United States Government and that they go back to the first State paper issued under the authority of the United States of America to explain actions which we intended to take to promote our spiritual and material happiness and security and to achieve our independence as a Nation. Because of this importance and because of so much confusion, I am including a compilation of 14 of these fundamental principles which it seems must inform United States action in foreign affairs if such actions are to be supported by the American people. Mr. Johnson has compiled this list of Fundamental Principles Underlying United States Foreign Policy, and I include it as part of my remarks in order to complete this statement on United States foreign policy:

FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES UNDERLYING UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

1. The right of a people to determine for themselves how they shall be governed. (self-determination): This principle is set down in the second paragraph of the Declaration of Independence.

2. Good-neighbor policy: In his Farewell Address, Washington put it this way: "Observe good faith and justice toward all nations. Cultivate peace and harmony with all."

3. Avoid inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachment for others: In his Farewell Address, Washington said: "The Nation which indulges toward another an habitual hatred or an habitual fondness is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. . . ."

"So likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest . . . gives to ambitious, corrupted, or deluded citizens (who devote themselves to the favorite nation) facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country without odium, sometimes even with popularity, gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion."

4. Noninvolvement in the affairs of other nations: In his Farewell Address, Washington said it this way:

"The great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign relations is, in extending our commercial relations to have with them as little political connection as possible."

This principle is closely related to the next.

5. Nonintervention in the domestic or foreign affairs of other nations: Washington said in his farewell address: "It must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves by artificial ties in the 'ordinary' vicissitudes of her politics or the 'ordinary' combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities."

Note here the emphasis President Washington laid upon the word "ordinary". This principle has been enunciated again and again by United States Presidents and Secretaries of State in successive administrations from Washington's down to the present.

6. The open door or equality of opportunity and nondiscrimination in international trade: President Washington said it this way in his Farewell Address: "Our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand, neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; . . . constantly keeping in view that 'tis folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character."

7. No permanent alliances: In his Farewell Address, President Washington said:

"It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world, so far, I mean as we are now at liberty to do it. . . ."

"Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments on a respectable defensive position, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies."

8. Right of expatriation: By the act of July 27, 1868, Congress had this to say:

"Sec. 1999. Whereas the right of expatriation is a natural and inherent right of all people, indispensable to the enjoyment of the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness . . . any declaration, instruction, opinion, order, or decision of any officer of the United States which denies, restricts, impairs, or questions the right of expatriation, is declared inconsistent with the fundamental principles of the Republic."

9. Security for ourselves along our boundaries: The emergence of this principle and the way it has been acted upon by successive administrations receives emphasis from the expansion of the United States control and jurisdiction over the continental lands westward from the Original Thirteen States until the Pacific Ocean was reached. It was this principle that moved Thomas Jefferson to send Lewis and Clark out upon the journey of exploration of the Northwest, and to declare that the United States would view with concern the transfer of New Orleans from Spain to France; the acquisition of the Northwest Territory in 1787; Tennessee in 1796; the Louisiana Purchase, 1803; West Florida, 1810; the rectification of the boundary between Canada and the United States, 1842; the annexation of Texas, 1845; California, 1848; the Gadsden Purchase, 1853; and so on.

10. Noninterference with and noncontrol by any European power over the affairs of governments of former colonies in this hemisphere, that have declared their independence and maintained it: President Monroe stated this principle in his message to Congress of December 2, 1823. He was disturbed about rumored movements on the part of European countries in trying to encourage resumption by Spain of control over former colonies.

11. Noncolonization by any European power within this hemisphere: President Monroe, disturbed over the activities of the Russians along the northwest coast of this continent stated this principle in his message to Congress of December 2, 1823.

12. Nonextension to this hemisphere by European powers of governmental systems hostile to our system of democratic government: President Monroe stated this principle in his message to Congress of December 2, 1823.

This principle has been appealed to in recent years, when we have been disturbed over rumored attempts by Nazi or Fascist organizations to extend their systems to this hemisphere.

13. Freedom of the seas: A principle of international law for which we have stood time and time again.

14. The freedom of men and women to travel upon their legitimate and innocent occasions without unnecessary or unreasonable let or hindrances: This is a principle that is suffering through ever-increasing restrictions upon travel.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I notice the gentleman from Nebraska has brought into the Well of the House one portion of the bill now before us. I know the distinguished gentleman who is now about to address us has also read and examined the Budget, which is a printed document of great size, which is submitted to the Congress each year and referred to the Committee on Appropriations. As a matter of fact, is it not true that in the Budget which is submitted to the Congress, and then referred to the Committee on Appropriations, anyone can see there a one-package bill and determine from examining the Budget itself just exactly what the President's estimates of expenditures are and what the revenues will be. Is that not true?

Mr. STEFAN. That is correct.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Nebraska yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I just want to make this observation in answer to the statement or question of the gentleman from Wisconsin, that while the budget estimate shows what the President and his Bureau of the Budget requests, it does not show the action of the Appropriation Committee of Congress which can only be shown at one time by a one-package appropriation bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Can the gentleman tell me why, from among the personnel who served the United States in the armed services, more persons were not selected to handle our affairs of state abroad; men whose loyalty cannot be doubted? I cannot understand this hasty selection of persons, some of whom have spent comparatively few years in the United States and who have been citizens of the United States only a short time. Can the gentleman answer those questions?

Mr. STEFAN. I cannot; I am sorry.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I rose to ask the gentleman before, and now, if it was his intention to include with his

remarks the list that he now has upon the table top in front of him.

Mr. STEFAN. I did not intend to include that with my remarks. I have it here for the information of every Member of the House. I understand, however, that another Member of the House is going to talk about this subject and he will undoubtedly include them with his remarks.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I would like to say as one Member of the House that it should be included so that it will be obtainable, because we have found at home a rising tide of interest in this subject and we dislike to talk in generalities. It seems to me we have reached a point in the discussion where we should be able to give specific information and anything the gentleman can supply will be very helpful.

Mr. STEFAN. I thank the gentleman. I wish to say to the members of the committee, I know it is very hard for all of you to go through these hearings on all of these bills, but I assure you that I personally know that every volume of this appropriation bill, which contains more than 70 percent of our requests for running our Government during the next fiscal year, is today being indexed page by page, and item by item, by the very efficient staffs of the legations, the embassies and the consulates of foreign governments whose staffs have been increased 100 percent, especially those representing countries behind the iron curtain. The employment in the Russian delegation in the United Nations, when the Assembly is in session, always increases from 50 to over 100, and I notice that the number of representatives of foreign governments who are presently in a diplomatic status in the District of Columbia, have increased over 100 percent. It is a very important problem, and if we are, as the chairman says, nearing a hot war, beware, America.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Nebraska yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Is it not the fact that as a result of this situation which the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska describes, it becomes necessary for the subcommittees on appropriations to hear a great deal of the pertinent testimony off the record?

Mr. STEFAN. I thank the gentleman. I will say that in making up my brief statement on this warning to America, I took into consideration many of the statements that were told to us off the record, and for reasons of security. When you take the floor, there are so many things that you do not dare to talk about. The gentleman will agree with me that the situation is alarming, will he not?

Mr. ROONEY. I certainly do. I will say to the gentleman from Nebraska that he is entitled to the commendation of this House for the presentation he has made here this afternoon. In my estimation, my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Nebraska, KARL STEFAN, is one of the ablest, if not the ablest, Member of the House Committee on Approp-

riations, and I heartily agree with what he has said here this afternoon.

Mr. STEFAN. I deeply appreciate the commendation of my subcommittee chairman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman knows my opinion of his ability and his loyalty and his anxiety to rid the country of Communists and subversive persons, and to have a Foreign Service that is the finest and most loyal in the world.

Mr. STEFAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

FACILITATION OF THE WORK OF THE FOREST SERVICE

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5839) to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1859)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5839) to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 and agree to the same.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
STEPHEN PACE,
W. K. GRANGER,
CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
AUG. H. ANDRESEN,

Managers on the Part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
CLYDE R. HOEY,
SPENCER L. HOLLAND,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
EDWARD J. THYE,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5839) to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service,

and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Except for minor and clarifying amendments, the differences between the bill as it passed the House and the bill as agreed to by the committee of conference and reported herewith, are set out below.

SECTION 12

Section 12, as it passed the House, was in the form of direct authority for the Secretary of Agriculture to use part of the grazing fees paid for the use of national forest lands for making certain range improvements on such lands. The money set aside for this purpose would have constituted a special fund which would have been available, without fiscal year limitation, for the purposes authorized in the section.

The principal effect of the Senate amendment is to require that the funds provided for must be appropriated by Congress. The Senate amendment also establishes a definite charge per animal-month as the measure of the authorization for such purposes. The purposes for which the funds may be used are exactly the same as those provided in the House bill.

SECTION 18

This is a new section added to the bill in the Senate. It provides specific statutory recognition of, and authority for, grazing advisory boards. Such boards have been employed for many years by the Forest Service as a medium of cooperation between the Service and the permittees using the grazing lands. There are approximately 800 such advisory boards at the present time and, under the terms of the amendment, each existing board will continue to be recognized by the Department of Agriculture until replaced by a board, or boards, constituted and elected as provided in the amendment. The boards have no administrative function or authority other than that of advising the Secretary of Agriculture on local range management as provided in this section. An important provision of the section is that which seeks to safeguard the recreational values of the range lands by providing that the State game commission or the corresponding public body of the State in which the advisory board is located may designate a representative to be a member of each board to advise on wildlife problems.

SECTION 19

This is also a new section added by the Senate. It authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to issue permits for the grazing of livestock on the national forests for periods not exceeding 10 years and renewals thereof. It has long been the practice of the Forest Service to issue such 10-year permits, but the authority to issue permits other than on an annual basis was recently challenged by a court decision. The purpose of the amendment is to give specific statutory authority for an established practice.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
STEPHEN PACE,
W. K. GRANGER,
CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
AUG. H. ANDRESEN,

Managers on the Part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RURAL REHABILITATION CORPORATION TRUST LIQUIDATION ACT

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 930) to provide for the liquidation of the trusts under the transfer agreement with State rural rehabilitation cor-

porations, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1865)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 930) to provide for the liquidation of the trusts under the transfer agreements with State rural rehabilitation corporations, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That this Act may be cited as the 'Rural Rehabilitation Corporation Trust Liquidation Act.'"

"SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary') is hereby authorized and directed to take such action as may be appropriate and necessary to liquidate, as expeditiously as possible but within 3 years from the effective date of this Act, trusts under the transfer agreements with the several State rural rehabilitation corporations, and is hereby authorized and directed to negotiate with responsible officials to that end.

"(b) The Secretary, insofar as is necessary to protect the interests of the United States and the corporations shall proceed forthwith to the conversion to cash of investments constituting the trust assets by sale of real and personal properties, and by collection of loans and accounts receivable according to the tenor of such obligations.

"(c) An application for the return of such properties may be made to the Secretary by the State rural rehabilitation corporation pursuant to appropriate resolution of its board of directors. The application shall contain a covenant, binding upon the applicant when accepted by the Secretary on behalf of the United States, that the applicant will abide by the determinations and apportionments of the Secretary provided for in this Act and the payments made by the Secretary pursuant to this Act, that the returned assets and the income therefrom will be used only for such of the rural rehabilitation purposes permissible under the corporation's charter as may from time to time be agreed upon by the applicant and the Secretary; and that not to exceed 3 per centum of the book value of the corporation's assets will be expended by the applicant for administrative purposes during any year, without the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture. If the rural rehabilitation corporation of any State has been dissolved and is not revived or reincorporated or, for any other reason, is unable to make such application or to accept and administer such properties, the application and subsequent agreements (conforming to the second sentence of this subsection) may be made by such other agency or official of that State as may be designated by the State legislature. The Secretary may transfer the trust funds or properties of such corporation to such successor agency or official if adequate provisions are made by the State legislature for holding the United States and the Secretary

free from liability by virtue of the transfer to such successor agency or official.

"(d) Except as hereinafter provided, upon receipt of appropriate application meeting the requirements of this Act, the Secretary shall do all things necessary to return to each such applicant all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to all cash, real and personal property, or the proceeds thereof, held on the date of the approval of this Act by the Secretary as trustee for the account of such State corporation, except that the Secretary may deduct from the funds of each such State corporation the expenses incident to completion of such transfer: *Provided*, That such transfer shall, insofar as possible, be accomplished in a manner consistent with the provisions of the trust agreement with each State rural rehabilitation corporation.

"(e) In the event no application is made, as provided for in this Act, within 3 years from the effective date hereof or upon receipt of a disclaimer or release of interest under the trust transfer agreement by any State through its legislature, the Secretary shall cause all proceeds from assets held under or for the account of the transfer agreement with that State to be covered into miscellaneous receipts in the United States Treasury.

"(f) The Secretary is authorized to enter into agreements with any State rural rehabilitation corporation or other State agency or official having jurisdiction of the trust assets which have been returned pursuant to application made therefor under section 2 (c) hereof, and upon such terms and conditions and for such periods of time as may be mutually agreeable, to accept, administer, expend, and use in such State all or any part of such trust assets or any other funds of such State rural rehabilitation corporation or State agency, which are transferred to the Secretary for carrying out the purposes of titles I and II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act and in accordance with the applicable provisions of title IV thereof as now or hereafter amended. Funds appropriated for the administration of said Act shall also be available for carrying out such agreements.

"SEC. 3. The provisions of this Act shall apply also to all properties and assets of State rural rehabilitation corporations held by Federal agencies other than the Department of Agriculture under the provisions of Executive Order Numbered 9070, or otherwise. For the purposes of this Act the assets of other corporations, derived through the use of Federal Emergency Relief Administration funds, and made available to them through State rural rehabilitation corporations or otherwise acquired by them for rural rehabilitation purposes, shall be considered as a part of the trust property of the State rural rehabilitation corporations in their respective States.

"SEC. 4. For the purposes of this Act, the Secretary shall have the power to—

"(a) employ on a contract basis (without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, but the contract shall in each case specify what civil service and related laws, if any, shall be applicable to the employment after it has been made; such appraisers, accountants, attorneys, and other personnel as he may deem necessary, in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, to aid in the liquidation and transfer of the properties and assets pursuant to this Act, and in the entering into of agreements with the corporations, or other agencies or officials designated pursuant to section 2 (c) hereof, regarding the rural rehabilitation purposes for which the property and assets shall thereafter be used by them, and in determining that such agreed purposes are being carried out. The fees, salaries, and expenses of such appraisers, accountants, attorneys, and other personnel shall be equitably appor-

tioned by the Secretary among the respective corporations and the amount so determined to be applicable to each such corporation shall be paid by the Secretary from the trust fund of such corporation until the trust is liquidated, and thereafter by the corporation or other agency or official designated pursuant to section 2 (c) hereof. Attorneys so employed, and their fees and expenses, shall be subject to the approval and under the supervision of the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture;

"(b) accept and utilize voluntary and uncompensated services, and with the consent of the agency concerned, utilize the officers, employees, equipment, and information of any agency of the Federal Government, or of any State, Territory, or political subdivision;

"(c) make such rules and regulations and such delegations of authority as he deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

"SEC. 5. None of the properties or assets held on the date of the approval of this Act by the Secretary as trustee pursuant to trust agreements with the various State rural rehabilitation corporations may be used by the Secretary for any purpose after the effective date of this Act, except for the purposes authorized under section 2 (d) of this Act, and for loans made prior to July 1, 1949, and to be repaid in full no later than May 1, 1952, but otherwise consistent with the provisions of title II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. A. 1007), where necessary to supplement credit already extended to borrowers from corporation trust funds.

"SEC. 6. (a) The determination of the Secretary with respect to the assets to be returned to each State rural rehabilitation corporation or other agency or official designated pursuant to section 2 (c) hereof including, but not limited to interests in properties held jointly for such corporation and the United States, the partition of real property, the expenses incident to each transfer, the liabilities applicable to such properties, and all other phases of the transfer shall be final and conclusive upon each State rural rehabilitation corporation or such successor agency or official designated pursuant to section 2 (c) hereof, and upon all officers and agencies of the United States.

"(b) The Secretary shall be saved harmless against any personal liability he may incur in carrying out the provisions of this Act.

"SEC. 7. Section 2 (f) of the Act of August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1032), is hereby repealed. And the House agree to the same.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
STEPHEN FACE,
W. R. POAGE,
CLIFFORD R. HOPE,

Managers on the Part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
CLYDE R. HOEY,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
MILTON R. YOUNG,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 930) to provide for the liquidation of trusts under the transfer agreements with State rural rehabilitation corporations, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

The bill S. 930, and a companion bill, H. R. 2392, were identical at the time they were introduced in the respective Houses. S. 930 was adopted by the Senate without

substantial change from its original form, whereas H. R. 2392 was amended in committee and the committee amendments were adopted by the House. Upon the adoption by the House of H. R. 2392, the Senate bill (S. 930) was taken from the Speaker's table, the language of the House bill (H. R. 2392, as amended) was substituted for the language of the Senate bill and S. 930 was thereupon adopted by the House. The bill before the committee of conference, therefore, was S. 930, as amended by substitution of the House language for the entire text of S. 930 as it had passed the Senate. In agreeing to the amendment recommended herewith, the committee of conference has accepted the 3-year option period provided in the House bill. It has left unchanged the right of the States to demand the return of the trust assets during this 3-year period and the provisions as to the manner in which those assets are to be used upon their return to the respective States.

In the matter of the disposal of trust assets other than those returned outright to the States, the amendment agreed to by the committee of conference strikes out that provision of the House bill which, in the absence of an application for a return of the trust assets, would have placed such assets in a revolving fund to be used within the State for purposes of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and includes a new provision, appearing as section 2 (f) of the conference report, which is in the nature of a compromise between the Senate and House provisions. This section authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into agreement with any State rural rehabilitation corporation, or other State agency having official jurisdiction of the trust assets which have been returned pursuant to the provisions of this act, for the administration of such funds by the Secretary, together with any other funds which may be transferred to the Secretary by the respective States, for carrying out within the State the general purposes of titles I, II, and IV of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. This will permit States which want to have these funds administered by the Federal Government to provide by agreement a program very similar to that in effect in the past.

In the bill as adopted by the House, there were the following two methods of disposing of these funds: (1) Return to the States upon proper demand (identical with the provisions of the Senate bill); (2) upon waiver by a State or failure to assert its claim within the time limitation, the placing of such funds in a special revolving fund to be used for the general purposes of titles I, II, and IV of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act within the respective States.

The conference amendment reported herewith authorizes disposition of the funds under the following alternatives: (1) Outright return to the States (the same as provided by both the House and Senate bills); (2) the return of title in the assets to the States with authority for the Secretary of Agriculture and the States to make a new agreement for the administration by him of such assets; (3) the covering of such assets into the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury if, upon the expiration of the 3-year period, the State has not exercised its option to claim the assets and have them administered under either of the two provisions described above.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
STEPHEN PACE,
W. R. POAGE,
CLIFFORD R. HOPE,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. Will the gentleman explain the differences between the confer-

ence report and the House version of the bill?

Mr. COOLEY. Actually, no very important changes were made in the House bill. The only very substantial change is with regard to the disposal of trust assets. The bill now provides for an outright rate of the assets of the several corporations. It provides a 3-year period within which the State corporations may make application for a rate of such assets pursuant to the trust agreement. In the event no application for a rate of the trust assets is filed within 3 years, the House bill provided that such assets would be placed in a revolving fund to be used within the State for purposes of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. The conference report, which is in the nature of a compromise between this provision and a provision in the Senate bill which provided that such assets would under such circumstances revert to the Treasury authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into an agreement with any State rural rehabilitation corporation or other State agency having official jurisdiction of the trust assets which have been returned pursuant to the provisions of the act and for the administration of such funds by the Secretary, together with any other funds which may be transferred to the Secretary by such corporations or other agencies, to be used in carrying out within the State the general purposes of titles 1, 2, and 4 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. This will permit States which want to have these funds administered by the Federal Government to provide by agreement a program very similar to that which has been in effect in the past or such other program as may be agreed upon and which might be compatible with the letter and spirit of the law. The statement of the managers on the part of the House, which has just been read, clearly indicates that the changes are not too important. I might observe, however, that such changes as have been made, I am certain, will meet with the approval of the officials of the Farmers Home Administration.

Mr. HOPE. There is a further provision, is there not, that if the funds are not claimed in either way by the States they will go into the General Treasury of the United States?

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Mr. HOPE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the committee of the conference has agreed on a bill to provide for the liquidation of the trusts under the transfer agreements between the Secretary of Agriculture and the various State rural rehabilitation corporations. The conference report (H. Rept. No. 1865) on the bill (S. 930) has been signed by the managers of the bill for the House and Senate and has been published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 31, 1950.

This bill, which originated in the House as H. R. 2392, was debated at length here in the House on March 1 and 2, and was passed. As will be seen from the conference report, only one significant change was made in the bill by the conference committee. That was the deletion of the revolving fund provision of section 2 (e) and the substitution for it of section 2 (f)

as a compromise between the provisions of the House and Senate bills.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LIQUIDATION OF STATE RURAL REHABILITATION CORPORATION TRUST ASSETS

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the addition of a new section 2 (f) was discussed in the House debates and was requested by numerous members of both Houses and the Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration in order that the bill might provide authority for the Secretary to contract with the State rural rehabilitation corporations or other State agencies or officials having jurisdiction of the corporate assets, hereinafter referred to as the "corporations" unless otherwise indicated, for the administration of all or a part of the corporate assets by the Farmers Home Administration.

While it is anticipated that some corporations may desire to have all of their assets returned to them for administration, it is anticipated that others will prefer to have all of their assets, except such as may be needed for their administrative expenses, administered by the Secretary through the Farmers Home Administration under section 2 (f) contracts, and that still others may prefer to have a part of their assets returned to them for use in carrying out particular projects, defraying their administrative expenses, et cetera, and to have the remainder of their assets administered under such section 2 (f) contracts. The bill permits such combination methods to be used.

Agreements entered into under section 2 (f) would provide for administration of the transferred assets by the Secretary upon such terms and conditions and for such periods of time as were mutually agreeable to the Secretary and the corporations. Agreement upon the rules and regulations governing the administration of the transferred assets would enable the corporations through their officials or designated representatives to keep abreast of the administration of their assets, should enable them to answer inquiries of State officials vested with authority to inquire into the administration of such assets, and should avoid any accounting problems with which the Secretary might otherwise be confronted at the termination of the agreements. The agreements could provide for administration of the transferred assets in the name of the United States and for use of its service agencies as at present, if that is considered desirable.

Agreements could be entered into under section 2 (f) for the purpose of permitting the Secretary to use corporation assets for the purposes of titles I and II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, and for other purposes for which they were previously used by the Secretary, if they were transferred to him for those purposes. The agreements could also contain such other provisions as are deemed necessary, so long as they are consistent with the provisions of the bill.

Agreements entered into under section 2 (f) could permit the Secretary to use a reasonable percentage of the transferred assets for expenses of administration thereof, or any amounts appropriated by Congress for that purpose. Expenditures for such costs of administration should be kept reasonable, consistent with the services required to be performed. Since the administrative functions under section 2 (f) contracts will be substantially the same as they were under the trust agreements, it would seem that such expenditures by the Secretary could be kept within the rate heretofore charged by the Secretary against the trust assets in connection with his administration thereof through the Farmers Home Administration, except for the cost of special personnel employed under section 4 (a) to aid the Secretary in liquidating the trusts, returning the trust assets to the corporations or States, entering into contracts under section 2 (f), and so forth. There would seem to be no good reason why Congress should make appropriations for administration of such assets, but that is a matter for consideration in connection with annual Department of Agriculture appropriation acts.

The entering into of agreements under section 2 (f) would be entirely optional with the Secretary and each corporation or other State agency or official having jurisdiction of the corporate assets, and at the termination of the original agreement or last renewal thereof, the assets then remaining of those transferred to the Secretary for administration, would be returned to the corporation or other State agency or official having jurisdiction thereof, in the same manner and to the same extent as if the 2 (f) agreement had never been entered into.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. TAURIELLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from the Buffalo Courier.

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address.

Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. VELDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and to include an editorial.

Mr. JENISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FOULSON (at the request of Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN) was given permission

to extend his remarks in two instances, and to include an editorial.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from today's Washington News.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

MORE EFFICIENT WORK FOR MARSHALL PLAN MONEY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, we are now at the halfway point of the Marshall plan. In the past 2 years some \$9,000,000,000 has been spent under this program for foreign aid—mostly for European recovery. It is proposed to spend several billion more before the program is completed.

The principle lying behind this program is certainly a splendid one. The countries of Europe whose economies were shattered at the end of the war needed help. They had to repair their cities. It was necessary for them to rebuild factories and put their farmers back on their feet. But in a world where the United States was the only country with goods to sell, the nations of Europe had no dollars with which to buy. The Marshall plan came as a timely solution.

Any plan that has been so costly and has been designed to achieve so much should, it seems to me, be looked at pretty carefully to see if the money is producing the desired results. Every Member of Congress, and every American, has a duty that goes beyond furnishing dollars. He owes it to himself to be satisfied that our dollars are spent in the wisest possible way. It is just as important that the countries being helped are rebuilding in the same fashion.

The main object of the Marshall plan is not charity. In originally passing the act, the Congress intended that European countries should be helped to use their own powers. The intention was to serve the American taxpayer, as well as less fortunate Europeans. Since the program began, its administrators have emphasized again and again that self-help was their first desire. Mr. Hoffman and Mr. Harriman, for example, have told us that they are doing their best to see that when the program ends in 1952 the 16 European countries will have healthy, expanding economies.

All this implies one thing. The countries who could not rebuild because they did not have dollars must have some ability to earn dollars in the future. Unless they do, the whole idea of foreign assistance will degenerate into the worst kind of charity. It will become an endless dole, of no real help to either the giver or receiver. Our main interest then, should be centered on whether or not the nations of Europe have been helped—and are helping themselves—to generate dollars now and for the future.

There are only a few ways for European nations to earn dollars. One is

through imports received by the United States. By this system, goods have to be made and sold to us before dollars can go abroad. And dollars must go abroad before they can come back to us in payment for our manufactured goods.

As we all know so well, this situation raises a problem for Europeans and Americans alike. Most foreign goods sent into our markets—or even into markets outside of this country in which we sell goods—cannot be sold without competing with our domestic manufacturers. Increasing the volume of the goods they sell in competition with us, means that Marshall-plan countries have to take the time to carefully study American tastes and preferences. They must make market surveys, open outlets, and compete with a country whose middle name is salesmanship.

It seems that these trade difficulties are being straightened out in the best way possible. No matter what the solution turns out to be, however, most European imports into the United States will not earn dollars without causing a good deal of painful readjustment. But there is one other way for these countries to get dollars. It is a way that will not hurt anyone in the United States while it is helping everyone in Europe.

I am talking about travel, or tourism, or whatever word suits your fancy to describe Americans going abroad. Every dollar they leave behind overseas will make the Marshall-plan area healthier. Every one of those dollars means more business for us because they must all eventually come back here to be spent. Every dollar taken abroad by an American tourist is the equivalent of one paid for goods imported into the United States. But in the case of the foreign-travel dollar, no threat is offered to American industry.

It is apparent that travel is important to the future health of Europe, but I do not think most of us realize just how important it is. In 1948, 210,000 Americans visited Marshall plan Europe. They spent \$103,000,000, or 19 percent of all the dollars the area was able to generate. Last year, 280,000 Americans went abroad to these same countries. They spent \$164,000,000, or 32 percent of all the dollars these countries were able to earn for themselves.

Consider the significance of these facts. Although the number of our people going to Europe increased by approximately a third, the amount of money they spent was more than half again the 1948 figure. This is an interesting trend. It shows that Americans stayed abroad longer on the average and that the Europeans had more to sell to them. But the figures show something much more important at a time when we are interested in the ability of the area to generate dollars.

Almost one-third of all the dollars earned by Marshall plan Europe last year was obtained from American travelers.

Actually the greatest dollar generator Europe has at present is its tourist industry. There is evidence to show that the possibilities of the industry have only been scratched. We can see how in 12 short months alone, the dollars earned by this industry jumped by 50 percent. It is estimated by Marshall-plan officials

that by 1952, \$800,000,000 will be spent by Americans in Europe. Projecting the figures into the future, we can see that the day is not far away when this industry can be earning sums that will not only keep the Marshall-plan nations healthy but will be helping us get back the money we are now putting into foreign recovery. Mr. Harriman himself has testified before a Senate committee that in time the annual amount spent by Americans traveling abroad could run as high as \$1,600,000,000.

The expansion of travel—and, therefore, the growth of Europe's most important dollar producer—depends on two physical conditions. It is pretty apparent that the urge to travel is very strong in this country. This is now particularly true among the large middle-income group, which has discovered that time and expense are no longer barriers to dreams. What these people want is enough reasonable transportation facilities to carry them across, or over, the Atlantic. And, like all people on vacations, they want their needs and wishes fulfilled once they are abroad.

The first condition does not really fall in the province of the Marshall plan. More and more passage space is being made available by commercial steamship and air lines. Competition and enlarged facilities are also both helping to lower these rates. Prospective travelers are finding that getting to and from Marshall-plan Europe is becoming easier all the time.

The second condition, however, that having to do with the European travel plant and facilities, comes very directly within the interests of ECA. Attracting the tourist abroad in the first place, and keeping him happy once he is there, is the definite responsibility of foreign countries in need of American dollars. In the same fashion it should be the concern of the Marshall-plan administrators, now trying to improve Europe's ability to earn dollars.

To develop the tourist industry to some proportion of its potential calls for many efforts on the part of foreign countries. The travel plant of Europe might well be regeared to cater to American needs and tastes. Among the most important requirements in this category are modern, comfortable, efficiently run hotels—the kind to which our citizens are used when traveling in this country.

Some idea of the role hotels play in the American travelers' plans can be realized from the fact that last year the average tourist planned to visit three foreign countries, one of which was almost always England. However, many of the travelers changed their plans and spent only 2 or 3 days in that country. They did not like the accommodations, the food, or the service. Because England was backward in these respects she lost a large number of American dollars.

Going beyond England to the Continent, the same neglect of the travel plant prevails. Generally there is nothing for the traveler to choose but the expensive, over-luxurious type of hotel, or the small establishment lacking both privacy and comfort. I do not mean to imply that Europeans should change their customs.

But if they want to attract a continuous and ever-growing stream of tourists to their borders they would be smart to give the American the kind of accommodations he prefers.

Much of the neglect of tourism can be laid to the short-sightedness of Marshall-plan countries. Many of them are spending hundreds of millions of our dollars on projects or industries that could not possibly measure up to the tourist industry as future dollars earners. In the latest studies made by these countries of their Marshall-plan programs, most of them do not even mention tourism as a dollar-producing industry. Only one—Italy—has asked for counterpart funds to be released for hotel building, modernizing, and other aspects of tourist promotion. That was in 1948 and has done little good. Many pilgrims going to Rome for the holy year will sleep in tents because the Italians have found out that a hotel takes 3 years or more to build.

Going beyond Europe to the Middle East, the same kind of lethargy is to be found on the part of foreign governments. A few years ago, for example, Turkey was considered to have tremendous tourist possibilities. Today the visitor who is attracted to Istanbul—the principal city—is lucky to get a half-way comfortable hotel room there. Yet many millions of Marshall-plan dollars, in direct aid and counterpart funds, have been spent in Turkey. It is questionable whether they have gone for projects that will help Turkey earn dollars in the future.

It may well be asked how foreign countries receiving Marshall-plan aid can go about doing something to help themselves earn more tourist dollars in the future. The answers to that are simple. They can make it easier for travelers to come to their country. They can make it easier for them to see things when they get there. They can modernize and expand their tourist plant.

For the latter purpose, counterpart funds might easily be used. Counterpart funds, as you know, are made up of payments in local currency for American goods. These are kept in the country and spent at the discretion of its government, with the consent of Marshall-plan officials, for local projects. It has been remarked that the most tempting project for many local governments is a reduction of their own national debts. This would, of course, represent a double contribution to a foreign country by American taxpayers and violate as well the whole two-way concept of the Marshall plan. Moreover, there is a strong legal reason for Marshall-plan countries to pay more attention to tourism. All the basic Marshall-plan agreements between the United States and other nations contain the following clause:

The Government of _____ will cooperate with the Government of the United States of America in facilitating and encouraging the promotion and development of travel by citizens of the United States of America to and within participating countries.

The wording is explicit and the intent is plain. When Congress drew up the Marshall plan it saw the potentialities of tourism as a dollar earner. Its foresight

has been proven. Now it is long past time for the countries being helped by our money to see the same truth and start some concrete plans and projects.

There is another question we might well ask ourselves with an appropriation bill for more Marshall-plan money soon to come before the House. Have those who administer the ECA done all they might have for tourism, specifically, in the light of the fact that it is Europe's greatest dollar producer?

Any honest answer to that question would have to hedge a good bit. Since July 1948 the Marshall plan has utilized a part of the Department of Commerce which had been previously designed and set up to encourage travel abroad. Under the difficulties of double command, spending only token funds compared to the sums given for other Marshall-plan purposes, the chief of this branch has done a commendable job indeed. But there is always the possibility that his actions would have been carried out if ECA had not existed at all.

Examining individual actions of the Marshall plan in promoting tourism gives the same fuzzy impression. Some months ago, for example, a number of foreign tourist experts and hotel men were brought here at the expense of the United States Government. The purpose of the trip was to acquaint them with American methods and desires. It comes naturally to mind that perhaps working a plan like this the other way round would have been more productive for all concerned.

Then, too, many projects that Marshall-plan officials claim to be encouraging tourism in foreign countries are open to different interpretation. Roads, for example, though helpful to a country's internal economy, are not serving tourists who will not go to that country because there is not a good place for them to stay.

It seems plain that the heart of this matter may have been missed altogether. There may be some excuse for foreign countries overlooking the fact that tourism as a dollar producer has no equal, though it would be a hard excuse for most of us to understand. It is even more difficult to conceive of any plausible reason for Marshall-plan officials to fail to bring this fact to a foreign nation's attention.

When we are spending for the purpose of helping other peoples in the world earn dollars, it would seem to be our simple duty to suggest that counterpart funds, at least, be used to build up the one industry that can earn more dollars for these peoples than all other methods combined.

My feeling for the principles of the Marshall plan is very strong. I do not see how any country like ours could face such need and not respond as we have done. But believing in the principles makes me even more critical about the practices. I think they should be just as perfect as thought and hard work can make them.

The truth about the Marshall plan is as simple as this. Unless it helps the nations of Europe to stand on their own feet, it will have failed. Those nations will have a hard time of it, indeed, if

their capacity to earn dollars is not improved. The one industry that is now earning the largest number of dollars—and which has the best chance to increase those earnings—is now being neglected. Something should be done to change this state of affairs.

My own desire is to see that countries now receiving help from us should do all in their power to put their tourist industries on an efficient basis. Marshall-plan officials responsible for strengthening the dollar-producing industries of Europe should not forget the most important one of all.

Without these actions the countries of Europe may well pass by a main chance to advance the welfare of the world. And the officials of the ECA will have failed to carry out the express wish of the American people.

[From the New York Times]

BRITAIN ONLY A WAY STATION FOR UNITED STATES TOURISTS ON ROAD TO A GAYER PARIS, MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT COMPLAINS

(By Clifton Daniel)

LONDON, March 10.—Britain was depicted in the House of Commons today as a place where American tourists stay for a day or two on their way to Paris "to enjoy themselves."

How to make American visitors happier—and more liberal in their spending—was the subject under discussion. It was the first topic considered by the new Parliament after the serious business of debating the Labor Government's legislative program.

The members apparently had been eavesdropping on American visitors or reading their minds. Edward Carson, Conservative, who initiated the debate, said that Britain needed more middle-class hotels and more imagination by hotel managements if it was to compete on equal terms with France and other countries.

Travel facilities, he added, are inadequate and expensive.

M. J. Lewis, the Labor member who described Britain as a way station on the high road to high times in Paris, declared that hundreds of thousands of tourists' dollars were being lost because of the rigamortale involved in buying goods without the heavy British purchase tax.

Also, said Mr. Lewis, visitors who went into hotels expecting to have a 5-shilling meal found that they had to pay £3 for a 10-shilling bottle of wine, plus music charges and house charges.

Because of the restrictions, Mr. Lewis declared, American visitors who might have remained here for many weeks departed after a few days for countries without restrictions.

William Teeling, member for the resort town of Brighton, recounted that on a recent visit to a hotel in Oxford he had been denied note paper in the evening and special cutlery in the morning, and could not get service in his room.

Replying to the complaints, Horace Bottomley, Secretary for Overseas Trade, assured the House that the Government was fully aware of the importance of tourist business, one of the highest dollar-earning industries in the country.

"We are aware of the need to attract the right kind of tourists," Mr. Bottomley said. "We want to get at the middle classes, who are now traveling more than before, and if we can appeal to them in any connection we shall do so."

He said the Government was doing all it could to show tourists that there were many places outside London where they could stay, and to release hotel accommodation. He also said it was considering a system of temporary hotels used in Sweden and the use of houseboats on the Thames for visitors.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Mass., of April 1, 1950]

EUROPE LOOKS TO UNITED STATES AT PATTERN FOR HOTELS

(By Stafford Derby)

NEW YORK.—Motels on the storied islands of the Aegean Sea, cool shower baths in Tuscan inns to wash away the dust of Italian byways, and ice water served for breakfast with no eyebrow raising in Parisian pensions may be in the offing for American tourists.

These possibilities are the result of a recent study of the hotel and tourist industry by 14 hotelmen from Greece, Italy, France, and Portugal here under the auspices of the Economic Cooperation Administration.

A 6-week tour took the overseas hotelmen to the Williamsburg restoration in Virginia, the boardwalk at Atlantic City, the Pocono Mountains of Pennsylvania, the noted hostelry in Saratoga Springs, N. Y., and Sturbridge, Mass., and ended in the sky-piercing giants of this city. Three points were emphasized by travelers at a round-table discussion:

IMPROVEMENTS SEEN

First, more middle-income Americans should enjoy travel abroad.

Second, improvement of overseas hotels and inns by introducing important incidentals to meet the habits of American travelers could be accommodated at once. Long-range mechanical equipment improvements would have to wait.

Third, American leadership in the back half of the hotel with its standards of cleanliness—even the air is cleaned—would be followed in modernization from Athens to Paris.

The group was here as part of the drive to bring more American dollars to the Marshall-plan countries through tourism.

BOON TO TOURISM

At the end of their education trip they were sure that what they had seen, learned, and inspected would bolster the entire tourist industry in their countries and, what was more—would attract return visits.

Lucien Serre, director of hotels in Paris, Cannes, and Biarritz, said:

"We've learned a lot about the way the average American eats and lives while traveling. We'll keep our French atmosphere, but we also will be prepared to serve a glass of ice water for breakfast without surprise."

"Motels and motor courts can fit into our country-inn arrangements very nicely. We can build cottages near the inns and attract the motorist."

AIM TO BOOST TRAVEL

"Next year is the two thousandth anniversary of Paris. We will be ready to take care of our guests this year so that they and their friends will want to return for that great celebration in 1951."

The French hotel director explained that "in 1949, tourism brought \$350,000,000 into France. By 1952 we aim for a \$500,000,000 total."

All around the table heads nodded at the 1952 figure—that was the official goal of Marshall-plan aid and the time when Marshall-plan countries needed to be strongest in dollars.

An observer from the Greek Government was a member of this group—second such to visit America. He was Capt. Tryfon P. Constantinidis, coordinator and inspector of the Greek tourist department.

HIGH LIVING STANDARDS

His broad impression from the trip betrayed his military training—he is an officer in the Greek Navy. "Organization for a direct aim—much as you did in the assault into Normandy—that is what we must learn."

As for the American middle-income group, the Greek officer was impressed by the high standard of living enjoyed.

"Here your American middle-income individuals live like the best. In Europe you can find no such standard. Here your farmer can hope to have \$500 and go abroad. At home this would be impossible."

He had seen women manage and supervise in the American hotels. "This is something new to us," said the Greek official. "But the way they help in the hotel business is something to think about."

SEA HIGHWAYS

His sea-girt homeland with its 120 islands was enthusiastically seen by Captain Constantinidis as a proper place for an adaptation of the motels of America.

Highways which are the feeders for such combination hotels and motor courts in the United States are practically nonexistent in Greece, he admitted.

But sea lanes. This was another matter. The classic blue of the sky over Hellas almost swept into the conference room at the Hotel Roosevelt, as the captain drew word-pictures of modern living accommodations on the islands, with picturesque sailboats the accepted mode of travel.

The Italians who were in the group included Dr. Ignazio Gardella, of Milan, an architect.

BETTER VENTILATION

Ventilation and shower baths caught his eye. Explaining that custom had required all bathrooms to be outside rooms in Italy, he believed now that with proper artificial ventilation they could be placed inside and thus be attached to many rooms.

Serafino Stoppini, hotel manager in Siena, also favored the ventilation systems seen in the American hotels—particularly in the kitchens, and storerooms.

Spiros J. Damigos, of Athens, said: "We have come to see what the American tourist expects when he goes abroad. We must go back and arrange things to make him comfortable. Now that we know better, I think we can."

Other members of the group were: France, Jacques Gauthier, and Pierre Lafon, both from Paris; Greece, George Canellos, Takis P. Caradontis, and Dimitri C. Liacopoulos, all from Athens; Italy, Dr. Costantino Gallia, of Milan, and Riccardo Zucchi, of Venice; and Portugal, Jorge Barreiro, of Lisbon.

(Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include some newspaper articles.)

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. SHELLEY (at the request of Mr. HAVENNER), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

To Mr. WELCH, for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

To Mr. WAGNER, for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1758. An act to amend the Natural Gas Act approved June 21, 1938, as amended.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 507. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lorraine Malone; and

S. 738. An act for the relief of Earl B. Hochwalt.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 4, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1355. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code, entitled 'Crimes and Criminal Procedure,' to provide basic authority for certain activities of the United States Secret Service, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1356. A letter from the Under Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to authorize the carrying out of the provisions of articles 12 and 23 of the treaty of February 3, 1944, between the United States and Mexico, by authorizing the acquisition of certain properties of the Imperial irrigation district of California, situated in the vicinity of Andrade, Calif., and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming:

H. R. 7977. A bill to authorize the city of Buffalo, Wyo., to make additional uses of certain lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 7978. A bill to provide compensation under the veterans' laws and regulations for a child whose legal adoption by a veteran of World War II was not completed before the service-connected death of such veteran; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 7979. A bill to authorize the development of the Feather River Basin for irrigation, flood control, and other purposes, as an integral part of the Central Valley project, California; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. LOVRE:

H. R. 7980. A bill to establish a United States Air Force Academy in the First District of South Dakota; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 7981. A bill to authorize the sale of certain land to the town of St. Ignatius, Mont., for municipal airport purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MARSALIS:

H. R. 7982. A bill to abolish the Wheeler National Monument, in the State of Colorado, and to provide for the administration of the lands contained therein as a part of the national forest within which such national monument is situated, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. O'SULLIVAN:

H. R. 7983. A bill to prohibit the transportation or importation of any goods, wares, or merchandise manufactured, produced, or mined by any person, firm, or corporation who has refused to bargain collectively, fairly, and in good faith with employees or who indulges in any unfair labor practices; prohibition against same; penalty for vio-

lating the act; and exceptions to the scope of the act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 7984. A bill to authorize the conveyance to the city of Miles City, State of Montana, certain lands in Custer County, Mont., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. R. 7985. A bill providing for an increase in salary for an employee of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 7986. A bill to authorize the preliminary examination and survey of reclamation district No. 768, Humboldt County, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 7987. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and preparation of plans and specifications for a new postal building in the Montavilla district, in Portland, Oreg., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 7988. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and preparation of plans and specifications for a new postal building in the Rose City Park district, in Portland, Oreg., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FORD (by request):

H. R. 7989. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to institute a program to assist in the rehabilitation of veterans suffering from neuropsychiatric diseases by means of conservation work on public lands; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 7990. A bill to incorporate the American Society of International Law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STANLEY:

H. Res. 534. Resolution providing for additional compensation for certain employees of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. Res. 535. Resolution for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Bowers Lawrence Hebard; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXVI, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. LUCAS:

H. R. 7991. A bill for the relief of D. C. Hall Motor Transportation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 7992. A bill for the relief of Daniel M. Templin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred, as follows:

2044. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the City Council of Cincinnati, Ohio, with reference to restoring \$1,000,000 cut in executive budget for the West Fork Reservoir; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2045. Also, petition of C. G. Roseberry, city clerk, Long Beach, Calif., requesting Congress to enact House bill 4258 in order that amounts paid for admissions to certain publicly owned recreation facilities may be exempt from the Federal admissions tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2046. Also, petition of J. M. Schneider and others, St. Petersburg, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2047. By Mr. LeCOMPTE: Petition of the Progressive Chautauqua Literary Circle, of Creston, Iowa, expressing opposition to any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 4, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, March 29, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, in the holy pilgrimage of this sacred week we fain would join devout multitudes treading the way of sorrow, as we lift our eyes to a green hill outside a city wall and to a lone cross against the sky, a cross so old and yet so new. As crusaders in the holy cause of human freedom may we conquer by that sign which forever is the inspiring symbol of joy through sorrow, strength out of weakness, triumph out of failure, song through sacrifice, gain through loss, and life through death.

O Thou whose nature is unbroken serenity, in these disturbing times make us quiet before Thee, quiet enough to see the paths our feet must tread, quiet enough to hear Thy voice, quiet enough to realize that in Thy will is our peace. We ask it in the name of Him who said, "My peace I give unto you," even in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of Monday, April 3, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2559) to authorize the extension of officers' retirement benefits to certain persons who while serving as enlisted men in the Army of the United States during World War II were given battlefield promotions to officer grade and were incapacitated for active service as a result of enemy action, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 930) to provide for the liquidation of the trusts under the transfer agreements with State rural rehabilitation corporations, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5839) to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes.